Volume XXXIX] *January, 1934* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

WRITTEN HISTORY AS AN ACT OF FAITH[1]

HISTORY has been called a science, an art, an illustration of theology, a phase of philosophy, a branch of literature. It is none of these things, nor all of them combined. On the contrary, science, art, theology, and literature are themselves merely phases of history as past actuality and their particular forms at given periods and places are to be explained, if explained at all, by history as knowledge and thought. The philosopher, possessing little or no acquaintance with history, sometimes pretends to expound the inner secret of history,[2] but the historian turns upon him and expounds the secret of the philosopher, as far as it may be expounded at all, by placing him in relation to the movement of ideas and interests in which he stands or floats, by giving to his scheme of thought its appropriate relativity. So it is with systems of science, art, theology, and literature. All the light on these subjects that can be discovered by the human mind comes from history as past actuality.

What, then, is this manifestation of omniscience called history? It is, as Croce says, contemporary thought about the past. History as past actuality includes, to be sure, all that has been done, said, felt, and thought by human beings on this planet since humanity began its long career. History as record embraces the monuments, documents, and symbols which provide such knowledge as we have or can find respecting past actuality. But it is history as thought, not as actuality, record, or specific knowledge, that is really meant when the term history is used in its widest and most general significance. It is thought about past actuality, instructed and delimited by history as record and knowledge—record and knowledge authenticated by criticism and ordered with the help of the scientific method. This is the final, positive, inescapable definition. It contains all the exactness that is possible and all the bewildering prob-

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the American Historical Association at Urbana, December 28, 1933.

[2] For a beautiful example, see the passages on America in the introduction to Hegel's *Philosophy of History*.

lems inherent in the nature of thought and the relation of the thinker to the thing thought about.

Although this definition of history may appear, at first glance, distressing to those who have been writing lightly about "the science of history" and "the scientific method" in historical research and construction, it is in fact in accordance with the most profound contemporary thought about history, represented by Croce, Riezler, Karl Mannheim, Mueller-Armack, and Heussi, for example. It is in keeping also with the obvious and commonplace. Has it not been said for a century or more that each historian who writes history is a product of his age, and that his work reflects the spirit of the times, of a nation, race, group, class, or section? No contemporary student of history really believes that Bossuet, Gibbon, Mommsen, or Bancroft could be duplicated to-day. Every student of history knows that his colleagues have been influenced in their selection and ordering of materials by their biases, prejudices, beliefs, affections, general upbringing, and experience, particularly social and economic; and if he has a sense of propriety, to say nothing of humor, he applies the canon to himself, leaving no exceptions to the rule. The pallor of waning time, if not of death, rests upon the latest volume of history, fresh from the roaring press.

Why do we believe this to be true? The answer is that every written history—of a village, town, county, state, nation, race, group, class, idea, or the wide world—is a selection and arrangement of facts, of recorded fragments of past actuality. And the selection and arrangement of facts—a combined and complex intellectual operation—is an act of choice, conviction, and interpretation respecting values, is an act of thought. Facts, multitudinous and beyond calculation, are known, but they do not select themselves or force themselves automatically into any fixed scheme of arrangement in the mind of the historian. They are selected and ordered by him as he thinks. True enough, where the records pertaining to a small segment of history are few and presumably all known, the historian may produce a fragment having an aspect of completeness, as, for example, some pieces by Fustel de Coulanges; but the completeness is one of documentation, not of history. True enough also, many historians are pleased to say of their writings that their facts are selected and ordered only with reference to inner necessities, but none who takes this position will allow the same exactitude and certainty to the works of others, except when the predilections of the latter conform to his own pattern.

Contemporary thought about history, therefore, repudiates the con-

ception dominant among the schoolmen during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth century—the conception that it is possible to describe the past as it actually was, somewhat as the engineer describes a single machine. The formula itself was a passing phase of thought about the past. Its author, Ranke, a German conservative, writing after the storm and stress of the French Revolution, was weary of history written for, or permeated by, the purposes of revolutionary propaganda. He wanted peace. The ruling classes in Germany, with which he was affiliated, having secured a breathing spell in the settlement of 1815, wanted peace to consolidate their position. Written history that was cold, factual, and apparently undisturbed by the passions of the time served best the cause of those who did not want to be disturbed. Later the formula was fitted into the great conception of natural science—cold neutrality over against the materials and forces of the physical world. Truths of nature, ran the theory, are to be discovered by maintaining the most severe objectivity; therefore the truth of history may be revealed by the same spirit and method. The reasoning seemed perfect to those for whom it was satisfactory. But the movement of ideas and interests continued, and bondage to conservative and scientific thought was broken by criticism and events. As Croce and Heussi have demonstrated, so-called neutral or scientific history reached a crisis in its thought before the twentieth century had advanced far on the way.

This crisis in historical thought sprang from internal criticism—from conflicts of thought within historiography itself—and from the movement of history as actuality; for historians are always engaged, more or less, in thinking about their own work and are disturbed, like their fellow citizens, by crises and revolutions occurring in the world about them. As an outcome of this crisis in historiography, the assumption that the actuality of history is identical with or closely akin to that of the physical world, and the assumption that any historian can be a disembodied spirit as coldly neutral to human affairs as the engineer to an automobile have both been challenged and rejected. Thus, owing to internal criticism and the movement of external events, the Ranke formula of history has been discarded and laid away in the museum of antiquities. It has ceased to satisfy the human spirit in its historical needs. Once more, historians recognize formally the obvious, long known informally, namely, that any written history inevitably reflects the thought of the author in his time and cultural setting.

That this crisis in thought presents a distressing dilemma to many historians is beyond question. It is almost a confession of inexpiable sin

to admit in academic circles that one is not a man of science working in a scientific manner with things open to deterministic and inexorable treatment, to admit that one is more or less a guesser in this vale of tears. But the only escape from the dust and storm of the present conflict, and from the hazards of taking thought, now before the historian, is silence or refuge in some minute particularity of history as actuality. He may edit documents, although there are perils in the choice of documents to be edited, and in any case the choice of documents will bear some reference to an interpretation of values and importance—subjective considerations. To avoid this difficulty, the historian may confine his attention to some very remote and microscopic area of time and place, such as the price of cotton in Alabama between 1850 and 1860, or the length of wigs in the reign of Charles II., on the pleasing but false assumption that he is really describing an isolated particularity as it actually was, an isolated area having no wide-reaching ramifications of relations. But even then the historian would be a strange creature if he never asked himself why he regarded these matters as worthy of his labor and love, or why society provides a living for him during his excursions and explorations.

The other alternative before the student of history as immense actuality is to face boldly, in the spirit of Cato's soliloquy, the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds—the dissolution of that solid assurance which rested on the formula bequeathed by Ranke and embroidered by a thousand hands during the intervening years. And when he confronts without avoidance contemporary thought about the nature of written history, what commands does he hear?

The supreme command is that he must cast off his servitude to the assumptions of natural science and return to his own subject matter—to history as actuality. The hour for this final declaration of independence has arrived: the contingency is here and thought resolves it. Natural science is only one small subdivision of history as actuality with which history as thought is concerned. Its dominance in the thought of the Western World for a brief period can be explained, if at all, by history; perhaps in part by reference to the great conflict that raged between the theologians and scientists after the dawn of the sixteenth century—an intellectual conflict associated with the economic conflict between landed aristocracies, lay and clerical, on the one side, and the rising bourgeois on the other.

The intellectual formulas borrowed from natural science, which have cramped and distorted the operations of history as thought, have

taken two forms: physical and biological. The first of these rests upon what may be called, for convenience, the assumption of causation: everything that happens in the world of human affairs is determined by antecedent occurrences, and events of history are the illustrations or data of laws to be discovered, laws such as are found in hydraulics. It is true that no historian has ever been able to array the fullness of history as actuality in any such deterministic order; Karl Marx has gone further than any other. But under the hypothesis that it is possible, historians have been arranging events in neat little chains of causation which explain, to their satisfaction, why succeeding events happen; and they have attributed any shortcomings in result to the inadequacy of their known data, not to the falsity of the assumption on which they have been operating. Undiscouraged by their inability to bring all history within a single law, such as the law of gravitation, they have gone on working in the belief that the Newtonian trick will be turned some time, if the scientific method is applied long and rigorously enough and facts are heaped up high enough, as the succeeding grists of doctors of philosophy are ground out by the universities, turned loose on "research projects", and amply supplied by funds.

Growing rightly suspicious of this procedure in physico-historiography, a number of historians, still bent on servitude to natural science, turned from physics to biology. The difficulties and failures involved in all efforts to arrange the occurrences of history in a neat system of historical mechanics were evident to them. But on the other side, the achievements of the Darwinians were impressive. If the totality of history could not be brought into a deterministic system without doing violence to historical knowledge, perhaps the biological analogy of the organism could be applied. And this was done, apparently without any realization of the fact that thinking by analogy is a form of primitive animism. So under the biological analogy, history was conceived as a succession of cultural organisms rising, growing, competing, and declining. To this fantastic morphological assumption Spengler chained his powerful mind. Thus freed from self-imposed slavery to physics, the historian passed to self-imposed subservience to biology. Painfully aware of the perplexities encountered as long as he stuck to his own business, the historian sought escape by employing the method and thought of others whose operations he did not understand and could not control, on the simple, almost childlike, faith that the biologist, if not the physicist, really knew what he was about and could furnish the clue to the mystery.

But the shadow of the organismic conception of history had scarcely fallen on the turbulent actuality of history when it was scrutinized by historians who were thinking in terms of their own subject as distinguished from the terms of a mere subdivision of history. By an inescapable demonstration Kurt Riezler has made it clear that the organismic theory of history is really the old determinism of physics covered with murky words. The rise, growth, competition, and decline of cultural organisms is meaningless unless fitted into some overarching hypothesis —either the hypothesis of the divine drama or the hypothesis of causation in the deterministic sense. Is each cultural organism in history, each national or racial culture, an isolated particularity governed by its own mystical or physical laws? Knowledge of history as actuality forbids any such conclusion. If, in sheer desperation, the historian clings to the biological analogy, which school is he to follow—the mechanistic or the vitalistic? In either case he is caught in the deterministic sequence, if he thinks long enough and hard enough.

Hence the fate of the scientific school of historiography turns finally upon the applicability of the deterministic sequence to the totality of history as actuality. Natural science in a strict sense, as distinguished from mere knowledge of facts, can discover system and law only where occurrences are in reality arranged objectively in deterministic sequences. It can describe these sequences and draw from them laws, so-called. From a given number of the occurrences in any such sequence, science can predict what will happen when the remainder appear.

With respect to certain areas of human occurrences, something akin to deterministic sequences is found by the historian, but the perdurance of any sequence depends upon the perdurance in time of surrounding circumstances which cannot be brought within any scheme of deterministic relevancies. Certainly all the occurrences of history as actuality cannot be so ordered; most of them are unknown and owing to the paucity of records must forever remain unknown.

If a science of history were achieved, it would, like the science of celestial mechanics, make possible the calculable prediction of the future in history. It would bring the totality of historical occurrences within a single field and reveal the unfolding future to its last end, including all the apparent choices made and to be made. It would be omniscience. The creator of it would possess the attributes ascribed by the theologians to God. The future once revealed, humanity would have nothing to do except to await its doom.

To state the case is to dispose of it. The occurrences of history—the

unfolding of ideas and interests in time-motion—are not identical in nature with the data of physics, and hence in their totality they are beyond the reach of that necessary instrument of natural science—mathematics—which cannot assign meaningful values to the imponderables, immeasurables, and contingencies of history as actuality.

Having broken the tyranny of physics and biology, contemporary thought in historiography turns its engines of verification upon the formula of historical relativity—the formula that makes all written history merely relative to time and circumstance, a passing shadow, an illusion. Contemporary criticism shows that the apostle of relativity is destined to be destroyed by the child of his own brain. If all historical conceptions are merely relative to passing events, to transitory phases of ideas and interests, then the conception of relativity is itself relative. When absolutes in history are rejected the absolutism of relativity is also rejected. So we must inquire: To what spirit of the times, to the ideas and interests of what class, group, nation, race, or region does the conception of relativity correspond? As the actuality of history moves forward into the future, the conception of relativity will also pass, as previous conceptions and interpretations of events have passed. Hence, according to the very doctrine of relativity, the skeptic of relativity will disappear in due course, beneath the ever-tossing waves of changing relativities. If he does not suffer this fate soon, the apostle of relativity will surely be executed by his own logic. Every conception of history, he says, is relative to time and circumstances. But by his own reasoning he is then compelled to ask: To what are these particular times and circumstances relative? And he must go on with receding sets of times and circumstances until he confronts an absolute: the totality of history as actuality which embraces all times and circumstances and all relativities.

Contemporary historical thought is, accordingly, returning upon itself and its subject matter. The historian is casting off his servitude to physics and biology, as he formerly cast off the shackles of theology and its metaphysics. He likewise sees the doctrine of relativity crumble in the cold light of historical knowledge. When he accepts none of the assumptions made by theology, physics, and biology, as applied to history, when he passes out from under the fleeting shadow of relativity, he confronts the absolute in his field—the absolute totality of all historical occurrences past, present, and becoming to the end of all things. Then he finds it necessary to bring the occurrences of history as actuality under one or another of three broad conceptions.

The first is that history as total actuality is chaos, perhaps with little

islands of congruous relativities floating on the surface, and that the human mind cannot bring them objectively into any all-embracing order or subjectively into any consistent system. The second is that history as actuality is a part of some order of nature and revolves in cycles eternally —spring, summer, autumn, and winter, democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, or their variants, as imagined by Spengler. The third is that history as actuality is moving in some direction away from the low level of primitive beginnings, on an upward gradient toward a more ideal order—as imagined by Condorcet, Adam Smith, Karl Marx, or Herbert Spencer.

Abundant evidence can be marshaled, has been marshaled, in support of each of these conceptions of history as actuality, but all the available evidence will not fit any one of them. The hypothesis of chaos admits of no ordering at all; hence those who operate under it cannot write history, although they may comment *on* history. The second admits of an ordering of events only by arbitrarily leaving out of account all the contradictions in the evidence. The third admits of an ordering of events, also by leaving contradictions out of consideration. The historian who writes history, therefore, consciously or unconsciously performs an act of faith, as to order and movement, for certainty as to order and movement is denied to him by knowledge of the actuality with which he is concerned. He is thus in the position of a statesman dealing with public affairs; in writing he acts and in acting he makes choices, large or small, timid or bold, with respect to some conception of the nature of things. And the degree of his influence and immortality will depend upon the length and correctness of his forecast—upon the verdict of history yet to come. His faith is at bottom a conviction that something true can be known about the movement of history and his conviction is a subjective decision, not a purely objective discovery.

But members of the passing generation will ask: Has our work done in the scientific spirit been useless? Must we abandon the scientific method? The answer is an emphatic negative. During the past fifty years historical scholarship, carried on with judicial calm, has wrought achievements of value beyond calculation. Particular phases of history once dark and confused have been illuminated by research, authentication, scrutiny, and the ordering of immediate relevancies. Nor is the empirical or scientific method to be abandoned. It is the only method that can be employed in obtaining accurate knowledge of historical facts, personalities, situations, and movements. It alone can disclose con-

ditions that made possible what happened. It has a value in itself—a value high in the hierarchy of values indispensable to the life of a democracy. The inquiring spirit of science, using the scientific method, is the chief safeguard against the tyranny of authority, bureaucracy, and brute power. It can reveal by investigation necessities and possibilities in any social scene and also offerings with respect to desirabilities to be achieved within the limits of the possible.

The scientific method is, therefore, a precious and indispensable instrument of the human mind; without it society would sink down into primitive animism and barbarism. It is when this method, a child of the human brain, is exalted into a master and a tyrant that historical thought must enter a caveat. So the historian is bound by his craft to recognize the nature and limitations of the scientific method and to dispel the illusion that it can produce a science of history embracing the fullness of history, or of any large phase, as past actuality.

This means no abandonment of the tireless inquiry into objective realities, especially economic realities and relations; not enough emphasis has been laid upon the conditioning and determining influences of biological and economic necessities or upon researches designed to disclose them in their deepest and widest ramifications. This means no abandonment of the inquiry into the forms and development of ideas as conditioning and determining influences; not enough emphasis has been laid on this phase of history by American scholars.

But the upshot to which this argument is directed is more fundamental than any aspect of historical method.

It is that any selection and arrangement of facts pertaining to any large area of history, either local or world, race or class, is controlled inexorably by the frame of reference in the mind of the selector and arranger. This frame of reference includes things deemed necessary, things deemed possible, and things deemed desirable. It may be large, informed by deep knowledge, and illuminated by wide experience; or it may be small, uninformed, and unilluminated. It may be a grand conception of history or a mere aggregation of confusions. But it is there in the mind, inexorably. To borrow from Croce, when grand philosophy is ostentatiously put out at the front door of the mind, then narrow, class, provincial, and regional prejudices come in at the back door and dominate, perhaps only half-consciously, the thinking of the historian.

The supreme issue before the historian now is the determination of his attitude to the disclosures of contemporary thought. He may deliber-

ately evade them for reasons pertaining to personal, economic, and intellectual comfort, thus joining the innumerable throng of those who might have been but were not. Or he may proceed to examine his own frame of reference, clarify it, enlarge it by acquiring knowledge of greater areas of thought and events, and give it consistency of structure by a deliberate conjecture respecting the nature or direction of the vast movements of ideas and interests called world history.

This operation will cause discomfort to individual historians but all, according to the vows of their office, are under obligation to perform it, as Henry Adams warned the members of this Association in his letter of 1894. And as Adams then said, it will have to be carried out under the scrutiny of four great tribunals for the suppression of unwelcome knowledge and opinion: the church, the state, property, and labor. Does the world move and, if so, in what direction? If he believes that the world does not move, the historian must offer the pessimism of chaos to the inquiring spirit of mankind. If it does move, does it move backward toward some old arrangement, let us say, of 1928, 1896, 1815, 1789, or 1295? Or does it move forward to some other arrangement which can be only dimly divined—a capitalist dictatorship, a proletarian dictatorship, or a collectivist democracy? The last of these is my own guess, founded on a study of long trends and on a faith in the indomitable spirit of mankind. In any case, if the historian cannot know or explain history as actuality, he helps to make history, petty or grand.

To sum up contemporary thought in historiography, any written history involves the selection of a topic and an arbitrary delimitation of its borders—cutting off connections with the universal. Within the borders arbitrarily established, there is a selection and organization of facts by the processes of thought. This selection and organization—a single act—will be controlled by the historian's frame of reference composed of things deemed necessary and of things deemed desirable. The frame may be a narrow class, sectional, national, or group conception of history, clear and frank or confused and half conscious, or it may be a large, generous conception, clarified by association with the great spirits of all ages. Whatever its nature the frame is inexorably there, in the mind. And in the frame only three broad conceptions of all history as actuality are possible. History is chaos and every attempt to interpret it otherwise is an illusion. History moves around in a kind of cycle. History moves in a line, straight or spiral, and in some direction. The historian may seek to escape these issues by silence or by a confession of

avoidance or he may face them boldly, aware of the intellectual and moral perils inherent in any decision—in his act of faith.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

New Milford.

Dr. Beard as president of the American Historical Association invited the distinguished historian Signor Benedetto Croce to be present at the annual meeting in Urbana. In his letter of invitation Dr. Beard expressed the hope that, in case Signor Croce could not attend the meeting, he would be good enough to write a letter on the present state of historiography to be read at one of the sessions. The following letter came in reply:

Napoli, 24 giugno, 1933

Mio caro Signore,[1]

Sarei stato ben lieto di poter accogliere il suo gentile invito e venire a cotesta Società storica americana per prendere parte alle conversazioni e discussioni che si svolgono fra i suoi componenti.

La vita del pensiero storico é strettamente congiunta con la vita intellettuale e morale, e in certo senso con lei si identifica. Quel che appare difettoso e turbato nell'una parte si riscontra difettoso e turbato nell'altra: il risanamento e il progresso dell'una tira con sé il risanamento e il progresso dell'altra.

E comune l'osservazione e il lamento che negli anni che stiamo vivendo c'é nel mondo una generale depressione dei valori ideali e morali, un soverchiare di quelli che si dicono materiali e che sono poi di carattere economico, e, in questo sconvolgimento della gerarchia spirituale, una spasmodica agitazione e un nero pessimismo.

[1] *My dear Sir:*

I should have been very happy to have been able to accept your kind invitation to come to the American Historical Association to take part in the conversations and discussions that are carried on among its members.

The nature of historical interpretation is closely linked with the nature of intellectual and moral life, and is in a certain sense identical with these. That which appears defective and confused in the one is correspondingly defective and confused in the other; the restoration of health and the progress of one brings with it the restoration of health and the progress of the other.

It is a common observation and complaint that in the years in which we are living one finds throughout the world a general lowering of moral and spiritual values, a domination of what is called materialistic forces, which are, after all, economic in character, and, amid this confusion of the spiritual order, a convulsive restlessness and a dark pessimism.

Human societies have had other great crises of the same kind, which have become increasingly grave in a series of minor crises of which their nature is composed, and it is

Le società umane hanno avuto altre grandi crisi dello stesso genere, che si aggravano nelle sequele di minori crisi di cui s'intesse la loro vita; e bisogna avere coraggio e pazienza, e via via sorpassarle. Sit tratta di rialzare negli animi quei valori depressi; e, per la già enunciata relazione di pensiero storico e di vita, a noi studiosi e scrittori di storia, spetta il dovere di rialzarli nel campo nostro: nella storiografia.

La buona storiografia, come la bella poesia, non é da inventare, perché c'é sempre stata al mondo e ha essa stessa una lunga storia. Ma bisogna innovarla sempre e conferirle quella energia che sia pari ai nuovi bisogni. Nella sua eterna qualità, essa é la storia dell'anima umana e dei suoi ideali in quanto si concretano in teorie e in opere d'arte, in atti pratici e morali. Considerata più specialmente come storia di atti morali e pratici, essa é una storia dell'*ethos* umano, la quale io ho proposto di definire *etico-politica,* per far intendere che, diversamente dalla mera storia politica, ha il suo centro generatore nella coscienza morale, e, diversamente dalla mera storia delle idealità morali, include la politica, l'economia, e ogni altra forma dell'attività pratica, che essa dimostra strumenti ed effetti di accrescimento morale o civile che si dica. Per usare termini di scuola e di dottrina, familiari a Lei e ai suoi collaboratori, la storia *etico-politica* é l'unità della *Histoire de la civilisation,* sorta principalmente nel secolo decimottavo, con la vecchia *Storia politica* o *Storia degli Stati,* risorta e riasserita in Germania nel secolo decimonono: l'unità di *Kulturgeschichte* e di *Staatsgeschichte,* ma l'unità profonda e non l'eclettico accostamento che si suol praticare quando ai capitoli sulla storia politica si fanno seguire pigramente nei libri quelli sulla storia religiosa, scientifica, economica, morale, del costume, e via.

---

necessary to have courage and patience, and little by little to overcome them. It is a question of reinstating in our minds these depreciated values; and, because of the relation between historical thinking and actual life, already explained, to us students and writers of history belongs the duty of raising once again these standards in our own field—that of historiography.

Good history writing, like beautiful poetry, does not need to be invented, because it has always existed in the world and has a long history of its own. But it is necessary constantly to redirect it and to breathe into it that energy which may be equal to new demands. In its eternal essence, history is the story of the human mind and its ideals in so far as they express themselves in theories and in works of art, in practical and moral actions. Considered especially as moral and practical action, it is the record of the human *ethos,* which I have chosen to designate as *ethico-politics* in order to make it clear that, as distinguished from mere political history, it has its life-germ in the moral consciousness; and, as distinguished from the mere history of moral ideas, it includes politics, economics, and every other form of practical activity; and that it exhibits instruments and effects of moral and—what might be called—civil growth. To use academic and doctrinal terms, familiar to you and your co-workers, ethico-political history is the union of the *History of Civilization,* arising principally in the eighteenth century, with the old *Political History* or *History of the State,* revived and restated in Germany in the nineteenth century—the union of

Una storia così intesa e coltivata libererà da due false storiografie che hanno avuto molta fortuna negli ultimi cinquanta anni e ancor oggi si fanno sentire dappertutto, e in alcuni paesi non solo predominano ma dominano senza rivali. Dico *la concezione materialistica della storia* e *la concezione etnica o razzistica:* la prima delle quali nega i valori ideali e morali e li considera come semplici maschere degli interessi e contrasti economici; e la seconda li nega parimente sostituendoli con pretesi valori naturalistici e rappresentando la storia quasi una lotta di cani e di gatti, o di varie specie di animali da preda. Sono due forme di ottusità storiografica che bisogna perseguitare non tanto allorché si presentano nella loro pienezza dottrinale di affermazione e di applicazione (perché in questi casi il loro assurdo é evidente), ma nelle loro conseguenze meno appariscenti a più insidio se, nelle disposizioni intellettuali che hanno ingenerato, nei pregiudizii che hanno introdotto e coi quali sviano e infiacchiscono il pensiero e contaminano i racconti dei libri storici.

Ora questi mali, da cui la storiografia odierna deve risanare per riprendere la lucida intelligenza delle umane opere ed eventi, non sono poi gli stessi mali che travagliano la società moderna, e di cui essa, in un modo o in un altro, più presto o più tardi, dovrà risanarsi, per un più libero e ampio respiro, per una più alta umanità? E non é questa una chiara riprova del circolo che ricorre tra pensiero storico e vita?

Mi abbia con particolare ossequio.

Kulturgeschichte and *Staatsgeschichte;* but a profound unity and not an eclectic juxtaposition such as is usually practiced in those books in which there have been casually appended to the chapters on political history, treatments of religious, scientific, economic, moral cultural, or other types of history.

History thus conceived and developed will free us all from two false historical schools of thought which have had a very favorable reception in the last fifty years and especially at present are felt everywhere, and in some countries these conceptions not only predominate but predominate without rivals. I refer to *the materialistic interpretation of history* and to *the ethnic or racial interpretation:* the first of these denies spiritual and moral values and considers them as mere aspects of economic developments and struggles; while the second also denies them, substituting for them pretended naturalistic standards and representing history almost as a battle of dogs and cats, or of different species of animals of prey. These are two forms of historical insensibility which should be attacked not so much when they present themselves in their doctrinal completeness of statement and application (for in such cases their absurdity is self-evident), but in their less obvious and more insidious consequences, in the intellectual tendencies they generate, in the prejudices they introduce by which they misguide and enfeeble thought and distort the course of historical narrative.

Now these evils from which the historical interpretations of our day must be purged in order to regain a clear understanding of human accomplishments and events, are they not the very same evils which affect modern society, and from which by one method or another, sooner or later, society itself must be cured so that it may inhale a freer, fuller air, and attain a nobler humanity? And is not this a clear confirming proof of the circle which integrates historical thought and life?

Please accept the expressions of my highest regard.

THE TRANSPORTATION OF CONVICTS TO THE AMERICAN COLONIES IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

THE proportion of convicts among indentured servants during the colonial period is a matter which has attracted the attention of many historians and of some statesmen. It is generally known that after an act of Parliament in 1718 convicts were regularly transported to America. Their numbers have been suggested, and may be reckoned with considerable accuracy from the Treasury Papers.[1] As for the prevalence of the trade before 1718, it has remained an obscure matter, known only from hints in state papers and an occasional mention in private correspondence. It is a fact, however, that the transportation of convicts was a regular and systematic pursuit throughout the seventeenth century as well as the eighteenth. The method and development of the process may be clearly demonstrated.

"But no power on earth", says Blackstone, "except the authority of Parliament, can send any subject of England out of the land against his will; no, not even a criminal. For exile and transportation are punishments at present unknown to the common law; and, whenever the latter is now inflicted, it is either by the choice of the criminal himself to escape a capital punishment, or else by the express direction of some modern act of Parliament."[2] During the seventeenth century there were only two such acts of Parliament which concerned felons, as distinguished from vagabonds or political prisoners.[3] One of these was a short-lived act of the year 1666, which permitted justices to take away benefit of clergy, and sentence to transportation notorious thieves and spoilers in Northumberland and Cumberland. This statute (18 Car. II. c. 3), applying only to special cases in the two border counties, expired after seven years

[1] Basil Sollers (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, II. [1907] 17–47) has pointed the way for the eighteenth century, and excellently summarized previous researches into this subject for the seventeenth. The fullest treatments are by Philip Alexander Bruce (*Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 1895) and James Davie Butler (*American Historical Review*, II. 12).

[2] Blackstone, *Commentaries*, I. 137.

[3] The Conventicle Act of 1664 is here regarded as directed against the Quakers, not as felons, but as political delinquents. The statute of 1670 (22–23 Car. II. c.7) respecting those who burn barns and ricks in the night, etc., allows the offender the option of transportation or death, and hence does not in strictness come within the category.

and was not renewed. The other act (22 Car. II. c. 5) was passed in 1670, and permitted justices to transport "such as steal cloth from the rack", or purloin ammunition under certain conditions. This act was invoked at least as late as the year 1763.[4] It is important to realize that with the exception of a few persons condemned under one of these acts, no felons were transported to America in the seventeenth century by reason of a legal sentence.

It is well known that there were in this period some three hundred crimes which were designated as felonies, and that a felony, where clergy could not be pleaded, was punishable with death. The laws were strictly determinative; the judge had no alternative. He could condemn to death, or he could reprieve the felon for some good reason, but there was no third course open and no lighter penalty which he might impose.[5] But this harsh code was by no means in complete harmony with the best thought of the times. From early days a wholesale slaughter of small thieves was avoided in various ways. The French and Spaniards were accustomed to use convicts for some of their colonizing and exploring expeditions in the sixteenth century.[6] Frobisher took some men from the jails of England. Governor Dale of Virginia suggested in 1611 that felons should be sent to that colony, believing that they would be at least as effective settlers as the disreputable crew which he had brought out with him.[7]

It was not until three years later that anything definite was attempted. On January 24, 1614/1615 the transportation of English convicts was inaugurated by James I., in a commission addressed to a large section of the privy council headed by the archbishop of Canterbury. The commission is worth quoting at length, for it sets forth the motives behind the system as well as the procedure which was to be followed:

> . . . Nowe of late wee finde by experience that with our people offences and offenders alsoe are encreased to that number, as besides the severitie of our lawes punishing offenders in felonies to death, It is moste requisite some other speedy remedy be added for ease unto our people. Wherein as in all things els tending to punishment it is our desire that Justice be tempered with mercie, Soe likewise it is our care soe to have our Clemency applied as that greate and notorious malefactors may not be encouraged, and yet the lesser offendors adiudged by lawe to dye may in that manner be corrected, as

[4] Two persons were transported under this act at the Hampshire assizes held on July 12, 1763. Public Record Office, Assizes, 23/5, *sub dat.*

[5] Sir Matthew Hale, *Pleas of the Crown*, I. 13.

[6] See Émile Campion, *Étude sur la colonisation par les transportés anglais, russes et français* (Rennes, 1901), pp. 44–45.

[7] Dale to Salisbury, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, I. 12. See also Bruce, I. 592–593.

that in theire punishment some of them may live and yeild a profitable service to the Comon Wealth in parts abroade where it shall be found fitt to imploie them. Wee therefore reposing greate trust and confidence in you our said lord Archbishopp . . . doe for us our heires and successors give full power warrant and authoritie by theis presents to you or any six or more of you whereof some of you the said Lord Chauncellor Lord Treasourer lord Chiefe Justice of England, Sir Ralfe Winwood to be twoe, to reprive and stay from execucon such and soe many persons as nowe stand attaynted or convicted of or for any robberie or felonie, (wilful murder rape witchcraft or Burglarie onlie excepted) whoe for strength of bodie or other abilities shall be thought fitt to be ymploied in forraine discoveries or other services beyond the Seas. This to be done after Certificate in Writing made unto you by any one or more of our Judges or Serieants at Lawe before whom such felons have bene tried. . . .[8]

The commission then continues, giving power to the same persons to bestow reprieved felons upon any specific undertaking they may see fit, and for a length of time which they are to fix. If such felons return within the time limit, or refuse to go in the first place, their reprieve is to become void. Finally it is directed that all proceedings in accordance with this commission are to be certified by the principal secretary of state at the time, and "to be entred and enrolled on Record by the Clarke of our Crown in the Office called the Crowne Office" belonging to the court of king's bench.

Two days after the date of this commission the first batch of convicts was reprieved. An open warrant by the privy council recited at length the substance of the commission. It then went on to state that having received a certificate from the recorder of London to the effect that a given list of men were of able body and fit to be employed beyond the seas, the council therefore did reprieve them, and appoint them to be handed over to Sir Thomas Smith, governor of the East India Company. They were to be conveyed by him or his assignees into the East Indies, or other parts beyond the seas where he might direct, with all convenient speed, and were not to return without a warrant under the hands of six of the privy council. Finally, the sheriff of the county where the prisoners were in custody was directed to deliver them to Sir Thomas Smith, or to whom he might appoint to receive them. There were seventeen names in the list. On July 7 in the same year, 1615, three felons were similarly reprieved upon certificate from a judge of admiralty, and three more upon the advice of the recorder of London.[9]

The commission had authorized the reprieve of "soe many persons as *nowe* stand attaynted". It is possible that the king intended only a

[8] Patent Roll, C. 66/2043, *in dorso*.

[9] *Acts of the Privy Council, 1615–1616*, pp. 23–25, 248.

temporary experiment. It is certain that no very satisfactory system for regularly reprieving and transporting convicts was evolved until the middle of the century. A number of different methods were tried with varying success, and convict transportation was a desultory process, reflecting its uncertain career in very mixed and ill-assorted evidence. After the initial commission which the king issued in 1615, there were at least six renewals, when in 1617, 1621, 1622, 1626, 1628, and 1633 similar power was given to the council. These reissues were rendered necessary by the death or removal of persons who had been of the quorum in former commissions.[10] The 1621 document excludes from reprieve criminals guilty of arson or highway robbery, in addition to the murderers and others already placed beyond mercy, but the rest of the renewals show no changes, and it is apparent that an attempt was made to develop a permanent mode of procedure.

There should be, for each reprieved felon, a certificate of his fitness, and a warrant of the privy council. There should also be a note of the proceedings somewhere in the archives of the king's bench. These latter evidences are probably buried in the plea rolls, if they exist at all. The other class, of certificates and warrants, is very incomplete, due perhaps to the uncertain and experimental nature of the process itself. For one Ambrose Smith, there may be found a certificate from the justices of Middlesex, with an account of his crime, dated June 13, 1618, while on the 14th there appeared in proper form a warrant from the council for his reprieve.[11] The case of John Throgmorton is illustrated by a petition from his grandmother to the council, asking for his reprieve and enclosing a certificate which she had obtained from the mayor and recorder of London. She further petitioned Sir Thomas Smith to take him to Virginia, and her efforts were rewarded with a warrant from the council.[12] But the number of justices' certificates which have survived is very small, and it is more remarkable that the warrants of the council appear to be incomplete. Stephen Rogers, for example, is noted in the Middlesex Sessions' Rolls as having been reprieved for Virginia,[13] but his name does not appear in any warrant of reprieve in the council calendar.

[10] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1619–1623*, pp. 306, 439; *1631–1633*, p. 547; *Parl. Papers* [Command 3425], 1882, *Reports*, vol. XXXVI., p. 116. The dates given in the text, however, are derived from the MS. index to the Patent Rolls (see under *Commission*). These commissions retained the common form of the first issue.

[11] Certificate: *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1611–1618*, p. 545. Warrant: *A. P. C., 1618–1619*, p. 170.

[12] *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1611–1618*, p. 556. Warrant in *A. P. C.*, p. 232.

[13] *Middlesex County Records*, John Cordy Jeaffreson, ed., II. 224.

From January, 1614/1615, to September, 1628, fifty-three felons were reprieved for transportation by the privy council, and the warrants were entered in the council register.[14] There are evidences that six other persons were similarly fortunate,[15] but their names cannot be found in any warrants. It is quite possible that all acts of the commission for reprieving convicts were not entered in the register; it is certain that our actual evidence of its activities is limited to the warrants for these fifty-three convicts.

Of these felons forty-one were handed over to Sir Thomas Smith, the last one being given to him on April 10, 1619. There is no means of ascertaining whether Smith sent them to Virginia or to the East Indies, but it would seem more probable that Virginia was the destination. The localities mentioned in the warrants do not offer any guidance worth following. Virginia was sorely in need of laborers, and Smith was allowed to use his own discretion in the shipment. From 1619 to 1628 the warrants merely direct that the felons shall be sent to Virginia, except that six are given to Lewis Hughes "for Virginia" in September, 1628.

During the two years following the first commission which James issued, thirty-four of the felons were reprieved. Thirteen more had been ordered for shipment by November, 1622, and the last warrant, for six, is found in 1628. Evidently there was a lack of enthusiasm for this process, and although the king renewed the commission in 1633, no action under its provisions seems to have been taken. Perhaps the method had been found to be too cumbersome, but whatever the reason may have been, the scheme was abandoned. From 1634 to 1640 convicts were reprieved for transportation, not by order of council, but by the king's own warrant. The languishing business of transportation was so far revived by this simpler process, that in six years sixty-four felons were thus saved from hanging.[16] Of these thirty are indicated as destined for Virginia, nine for St. Christopher, and twenty-five were given to Philip Bell, probably for Barbados.

The troubled years of the Civil War do not furnish any evidence worth mentioning concerning the transportation of convicts. There was employment in the armies for all who were worthy. Nevertheless we

[14] *A. P. C.*, and *A. P. C., Col., passim.*

[15] *Mid. County Rec.*, II. 224, 226. *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1619–1623*, pp. 111, 213, 284, 552.

[16] *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1634–1635*, p. 166; *1635*, pp. 262, 535; *1635–1636*, p. 437; *1638–1639*, p. 183; *1639–1640*, pp. 183, 349, 486. *Cal. St. Ps., Col.*, I. 219. C. O. 1/9, no. 125, I.

find that in March, 1645/1646, Parliament granted permission to Captain William Fortescue to take "several" prisoners from Winchester House prison to Barbados. Likewise in July, 1649, an act of the House of Commons empowered justices to transport sixty felons to the Summer Islands, or elsewhere.[17] There is just enough evidence to show that convict transportation was a familiar procedure, and was not forgotten even in the turmoils of war.

An important change in legal procedure took place about 1655, when the first convicts were transported with conditional pardons under the great seal. This method became standardized for all crimes until 1718, and for major felons until the nineteenth century. The first record of it is found on the Patent Roll for 1655, under date of August 2, where there appears a pardon granted to certain prisoners who had been convicted of small crimes at the Surrey assizes. It is of the usual and time-honored form, save of course that it is in English, and issued in the name of the lord protector. At the end there is inserted the following clause:

> Provided nevertheles and upon this Condicon that they the said Richard Biggs . . . [three other names] . . . and every of them shallbee by the Care of our Sheriffe of the said County of Surrey transported beyond the seas to some English Plantacon with all Convenient speed and if they or any of them shall refuse to bee transported being thereunto required or make any Escape or retorne into England within tenn yeares after theire said Transportacon without Lawful Licence first had then this our present Pardon to them soe refuseing escapeing or retorning to bee null and voyd. . . .[18]

The machinery of the conditional pardon was simple, and remained exactly the same throughout the century. After a jail delivery or other major assize, the justices sent up to the secretary of state a pardon fully drafted for such of the convicted felons as they considered worthy of a better fate than death. They might, or they might not, pronounce the prescribed sentence of death; if they did so, they stayed execution until their merciful recommendation had reached the king. Such a document was always signed by two justices, or often in the case of the Newgate delivery, by the mayor and recorder of London. The formal pardon in Latin was followed by a docket, giving again in English the name of each prisoner with his crime. Later in the century special reasons for mercy in individual cases were sometimes added, and in such cases one justice signed for such of the prisoners as he had himself tried. This complete document, called the King's Bill, was then signed by the king

[17] Leo Francis Stock, *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America*, I. 175–176, 210–211.

[18] Patent Roll, C.66/2912, no. 3.

and countersigned by the secretary of state, and a note added that the bill was to pass by immediate warrant, that is, without the usual writs of signet and privy seal. It was then handed to the chancery and issued in the customary way.[19] The whole process became purely formal, and no single instance has been found where a pardon so recommended was refused, although the king often commanded that additional persons be included. On the Patent Roll for 1655–1656, which has already been mentioned, there are three conditional pardons, whereby twenty-five persons were condemned to expiate their crimes in the plantations.[20] Although it is certain that similar conditional pardons were issued between 1656 and 1660,[21] a gap in the series of Patent Rolls makes the collection of complete statistics impossible. From 1660, however, the series of rolls is unbroken, and the number of felons destined for transportation may be learned by counting the names of those pardoned conditionally. Such a count made by the author showed a total of 4431 persons pardoned for transportation between 1655 and 1699.[22]

[19] Sir H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes on . . . the Great Seal* (London, 1926), pp. 92–96, and ch. V. It follows that the complete series of justices' recommendations for clemency may be found in the Chancery Warrants class (C.82). The exact phraseology of the pardons varied consistently according to the localities from whence they came, which argues that the drafting was done by permanent local officials.

[20] An earlier instance of a conditional pardon which may have been a transportation pardon is worth noting. It will be seen that the council was utilized as intended in the king's first commission, although the legal formality was a pardon. The date is February 1, 1623, and the pardon is for sixty persons. The relevant words are as follows: "Proviso tamen semper ac intentio nostra est et sic per presentes statuimus et ordinamus Quod omnes et singules personae superius in presentibus mentionati . . . limitabuntur mittentur et disponantur . . . ad talia negocia labores et servicia aut in partibus transmarinis aut infra Dominia nostra facienda et exequenda et pro tali tempore et talibus temporibus quale aliquibus sex aut pluribus de privato Consilio nostro melius videbit expedire. . . ." (C. 66/2277, no. 9). The pardon goes on to state that this is done to make these criminals useful to the commonwealth, and it provides against their refusal or return. An examination of many other collective pardons for this period has failed to disclose any with similar conditions.

[21] The Middlesex Sessions' Rolls contain notes of prisoners who pleaded their transportation pardons in court. See *Mid. County Rec.*, III. 247, 292, 294, 296.

[22] This figure is only approximately accurate, but it certainly shows a minimum. In making this count, it was necessary to use the contemporary manuscript indexes of the Patent Rolls, where all pardons presumably appear under the heading "Pardonaciones". It is then necessary to refer to the roll, to ascertain whether or not there is a condition of transportation in the pardon. A number of pardons, however, were indexed only under the name of the grantee, and in at least one instance a group pardon, including a conditional clause, was thus indexed under the name of the first person appearing in it. This one was discovered by chance, but there are undoubtedly some others which were missed. After about 1670, the indexes appear to be more reliable. Sometimes if a convict or group of convicts were not immediately shipped, and so remained in prison until the next pardon

There is a considerable amount of scattered evidence concerning convict transportation during the last forty years of the seventeenth century which has been familiar to students for a long time. It would be instructive to review all this evidence in the light of a fuller knowledge of the process, but space will not permit the necessary detail. A few salient facts may be noticed, however, in illustration of the course of procedure.

It would appear that a rediscovery of the use of conditional pardons was necessary at the Restoration, despite Cromwell's ample precedents. When on June 19, 1661, a company of London merchants headed by Jeremy Bonnell petitioned the king for divers convicts to be shipped to Jamaica, their request was delayed for some time because of the hesitancy of the recorder of London and the lord chief justice.[23] It may well be that these lawyers remembered Cromwell's convenient method. The delay ended, however, when the recorder insisted on a pardon being issued under the great seal. The merchants accordingly petitioned, on July 19, for such a pardon. The convicts were granted them, and the recorder's legal conscience was satisfied on August 24, when seventy-three prisoners from Newgate received their pardon in proper form. The transportation clause was as follows:

> . . . Proviso tamen ac est vera mens et intentio harum nostrarum litterarum patentium Pardonacionis quod ipsi praedicti Edwardus Beckford . . . ac eorum quilibet et earum quelibet per Thomam Middleton Alexm Howe Jeremia Bonell et Edwardum Barnard de London mercatores et alios de societate sua indilate transportentur extra hoc Regnum Anglie trans mare ad Insulam nostram de Jamaica. . . .[24]

The merchants were required by the pardon to give security to the sheriffs of London and Middlesex for the safe conveyance of all the felons, and the period of exile was fixed at ten years.

With this discussion the formality of transportation appears to have been settled, and thereafter no more is heard of the legal details. The *Proviso* clause soon took on a form and wording which remained practically unchanged, while the clause concerning security went through various small changes, and varied also according to the locality in which the pardon was drafted. With the exception of the pardon just quoted,

for the circuit was issued, they were renamed in the second pardon. To avoid any gross error from this cause, I transcribed all names from Newgate pardons, and all from the provincial pardons for a period of ten years. Comparatively few repetitions were actually found.

[23] See the course of this matter in *A. P. C., Col.*, I. 310, 314, 315.

[24] Patent Roll, C.66/2986, no. 1.

no recipients of convicts are ever named in the documents, and nothing other than a formula is used to prescribe their destination. We may here transcribe the relevant section from the Newgate pardon of May 23, 1684, as giving the customary form for the entire forty years:

> Proviso tamen quod si ipsi Stephanus Bumpstead . . . aut eorum aliquis vel earum aliqua non exibunt vel exibit extra Angliam transituri super mare versus Insulam vel Insulas vocatam les Barbadoes vel Jamaica aut aliquam aliam partem Americe modo Inhabitatam per subditos nostros quamprimum opportunitas fuerit infra spatium sex mensium proximorum post datam presentem aut si ipsi vel ipse aut eorum aliquis vel earum aliqua infra septem annos immediate proximos sequentes eosdem sex menses proximos post datam presentem remanebunt vel remanebit aut redibunt vel redibit in Angliam Quod tunc hec nostra pardonacio sit et erit omnis vacua et nullius vigoris. . . .[25]

The term of seven years' exile became fixed, while the time allowed before starting varied from two to ten months according to the distance from a port, or to any particular necessity.

Much light is thrown upon the process of convict transportation by the negotiations of the island of St. Christopher to obtain some convicts for strengthening the white man power of the island. The full story is long and tedious,[26] but it may be summarized briefly as follows. In the year 1675 it occurred to the governor of the Leeward Islands that some malefactors and poor debtors should be sent out to build up the depleted white population of the islands. The lords of trade and plantations approved the scheme, but when some of the Leeward Islands merchants were consulted, they refused to transport the convicts unless the jail fees were paid by the government. The lords thereupon entered upon an investigation of the amount of such fees, and by the year 1677 an authorization had been received for the sheriffs to pay £465 in fees, for which they would be reimbursed out of the exchequer. Nothing happened, however, until in July, 1680, the council of St. Christopher revived the scheme. Again the machinery of government was set ponderously in motion, and on June 21, 1681, the lords informed Mr. Hill, who asked leave to transport the convicts, that he must enter into two good securities of £5000 to carry them safely to St. Christopher and Nevis. Neither Mr. Hill, nor anyone else, was prepared to produce such enormous securities. On September 30, 1682, the lords reduced the amount to

[25] Patent Roll, C.66/3245, no. 16.

[26] The story is fully told by C.S.S. Higham, in *The Development of the Leeward Islands under the Restoration, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 1921). Many of the letters of Christopher Jeaffreson may be found in John Cordy Jeaffreson, ed., *A Young Squire of the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1878).

£100 per convict, and they composed a form to be inserted in the pardon, a form differing in several respects from that already in use. Upon the petition of Christopher Jeaffreson the security was still further reduced to £20 per convict, while Governor Stapleton was recommended to pass a law enforcing eight years' servitude for transported felons.[27] Jeaffreson decided to take the venture, but he met with strong opposition from the recorder of London and the jailer of Newgate. These gentlemen, it would seem, had been accustomed to do business with Jamaica merchants, and they had received higher fees than Jeaffreson was prepared to pay. They also objected to his desire to pick and choose able-bodied male convicts. In the end, Jeaffreson was obliged to take men and women together, as they came, and he eventually shipped sixty-eight felons, in two lots, nine years after the original permission had been granted by the lords of trade and plantations.

The investigation carried out by the lords of trade and plantations into the necessary jail fees produced the following statement from the sheriff of London:

Honoured Sir, In obedience to your Commands I here with send you an Abstract of the Fees which are usually paid for Malefactors that are pardoned for transportation, etc.:

To the Clerk of the Peace and all The Officers neere Him

It. For searching the Record, and drawing the Certificate for every Prisoner pardoned: And for drawing the pardon in paper and afterwards ingrossing the same for The King's Majesties hand, and for the Allowance and entering the same upon Record is £00:13:4

To the Clerk for ingrossing the Pardon for the Great Seale for every person pardoned 2:6

To the Sword Bearer for every person pardoned 1:4

To Capt: Richardson The Jaylor and his man the Turnkey 13:10

£1:11:—: each person 1:11

The Recorder of London saith when there is a considerable number of These Malefactors transported, at each time there is usually given unto his Clerke five pounds.

Fish[ers] hall this
10th of Feb[r] 1675

Sir Your most faithful and
humble Servant
John Shorter [28]

[27] *Cal. St. Ps., Col., 1681–1685,* nos. 147, 232, 429, 619, 717, 800, 802. The form is as follows:

Proviso semper quod si dicti Jacobus Beversham et Benjamin Beversham seipsos transportent in partes transmarinas ante vicessimum nonum diem Septembris proximum sequentem post Datam presentem aut si post talem transportationem illi seu eorum alter revertent aut revertet infra spatium quatuor annorum proximorum sequentium datam hujus pardonationis sine Licentia Nostra . . . in ea parte concessa quod tunc hac littera Nostra Patens et omnia in eisdem contenta vacua erunt et nullius effectus in lege. C.O. 324/4, p. 84. Unless a *non* be introduced into the first clause this is meaningless.

[28] C.O. 324/4, pp. 30–31.

This statement gives the minimum charge, of thirty-one shillings, for which a convict could be freed from prison and shipped to the plantations. It is evident from the whole story, however, that the officials, particularly the recorder and the jailer, expected much higher perquisites. Jeaffreson was authorized to take convicts for these minimum charges, but in the end he decided to pay fifty-five shillings apiece for them, "Mr. Recorder having twice declared that this business of transportation of the convicts in this manner is £30 or £40 out of his way".[29] A writer of the year 1649 tells us that the average cost of procuring a servant from a "cook-house" was £3,[30] so that the opportunity of collecting a cargo of servants from Newgate at thirty-one shillings each was too good to be permanent.

Another point of some interest which emerges from this story is that convict transportation was exclusively a legal and a commercial matter. It had gone its way unmolested for some years, when the Leeward Islands introduced a political element by endeavoring to secure felons without paying the usual fees. The lords of trade and plantations took up the matter, probably for the first time, and displayed a remarkable ignorance of the business. Vested interests and long practice proved too much for the new project. Jeaffreson abandoned his scheme after the second shipment, and convict transportation returned to its usual course. It is decisively demonstrated that the colonial administration took little or no cognizance of transportation.

At the end of the century, convict transportation again appears among the matters considered by the colonial administration, this time for a very different reason. Virginia and Maryland had passed laws forbidding the importation of convicts, and the temporary peace with France had made the problem of man power in the West Indies less pressing. In December, 1696, the merchants of Jamaica attending the council of trade and plantations refused the offer of eighty malefactors condemned to transportation "because most of them were women, and because persons of bad character were not wanted in Jamaica". No one, in fact, would take the convicts. The only colony which showed any interest in such immigrants was Barbados, but no merchants could be found to risk transporting them for sale. By the summer of 1697 the crush of felons, especially of women, in Newgate had become so great that complaints were heard from citizens who lived near the prison. It became necessary to arrange for their transportation with the commissioners of transports, while an investigation showed that they were not wanted anywhere save

[29] Jeaffreson, *Young Squire*, II. 122–123, 127–128.

[30] William Bullock, *Virginia Impartially Examined*, p. 47.

in the Leeward Islands.[31] The business had broken down, in short, because the demand for white servants had lessened in the West Indies, and because convicts could not be imported to Maryland and Virginia.

Transportation pardons continued to be granted, however, until the first years of the eighteenth century. In 1704, we find that a change has been made. The Newgate pardon for that year sentences ten women and one man to the colonies, while nine men are pardoned for service in the army. In 1705 the women are sent to the workhouse for one year, and the men to the war. Thenceforth the number of persons pardoned for transportation is negligible, until 1715, when seventy-three felons from Newgate were again reserved for transportation in the old manner. Probably there was no better success in securing the shipment of these felons, for we find that on December 7, 1716, a contract was made with one Francis March by which he was to receive forty shillings apiece for all convicts whom he should cause to be transported. A group of fifty-nine convicts was pardoned on December 16, and March received £108 upon presenting to the treasury a certificate of their shipment.[32] The precedent was thus furnished for the act of Parliament in the following year, and for the large contracts of Jonathan Forward and his successors.

Leaving now the legal and administrative procedure, there must be considered the problem of the actual shipment of the pardoned felons. This matter was left to the supervision of the sheriffs, or of the recorder of London. It was enjoined, usually in the pardon itself, that good security should be demanded from the shipper that the convicts would be duly removed and safely carried to the colony, and after the use of pardons under the great seal became customary, the choice of a ship or merchant was no longer made by the executive, but was left to the discretion of the sheriffs. Broadly speaking, it is obvious that shipments must have been made with some regularity, and that a system consistently followed for more than forty years must have worked as it was intended to work. But there is no complete record of shipments, and evidence shows conclusively that this was the most uncertain part of the system. It is open to question whether all of the 4500 pardoned convicts were actually shipped; in fact it is practically certain that many of them were not. The existing evidence upon this doubtful point must therefore be considered in some detail.

[31] This account is greatly compressed from the following references. *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1697*, pp. 160. 167, 202, 210, 221, 332, 439; *Cal. St. Ps., Col., 1696–1697*, nos. 535, 657, 1134, 1140, 1156, 1157, 1166, 1172, 1190, 1194, 1195, 1189, 1205, 1216, 1398; *1697–1698*, no. 1.

[32] Treasury Money Book, T. 53/25, p. 224.

During the first ten years after 1660 there are occasional warrants from the king, directing the sheriffs to hand over certain prisoners to captains for transportation. In April, 1662, Captain William Joy was given fifteen prisoners, and in October some more were assigned to Captains Foster and Longman. In the same month, a cryptic letter states that the king had charged "certain persons" with transporting felons, and all warrants were to be made out to them until they had transported a "certain number". But in December the sheriffs of London were granted the transportation of twenty felons, in order to reward them for the charge of maintaining prisoners awaiting transportation, and the warrant further remarks that the sheriffs are in a better position to manage such shipments than are other men. The next notice is in 1664. On November 29, a circular letter informed the sheriffs that the king had granted to Sir James Modyford for five years the privilege of taking all pardoned felons from the jails of all circuits, and transmitting them to his brother Sir Thomas Modyford, for the better improving of the island of Jamaica. A grant of £1200 had already been made, on November 12, to Sir Thomas for the cost of transporting one thousand passengers to Jamaica, which number may have included some convicts. The order seems to imply that all convicts went to Jamaica during five years from 1664. Yet in February, 1667, one John Pate petitioned the king for licence to transport twenty-one convicts to Virginia, and this petition was granted. Another was given to Robert Ingram in the same year, but no more important warrants of this kind are known.[33]

The evidence just presented seems to indicate that the majority of convicts during this period went to Jamaica. It will be remembered that the first large group pardon after the Restoration was issued upon the petition of Jamaica merchants, and named Jamaica as the destination of the convicts. The crown was much interested in the peopling of Jamaica, and so would probably encourage such ventures. Finally, it is certain that the volume of convict transportation to Jamaica was considerable, for in July, 1672, a special order was necessary to regulate the disposal of criminals in the island, and prevent them from staying in Port Royal. On the other hand, there must have been a considerable number shipped to Virginia, for that colony became sufficiently alarmed to pass a law in 1670 prohibiting the further introduction of "jail-birds", and it was then

[33] *Cal. St. Ps., Col., 1661–1668*, nos. 292, 377, 382, 394; S. P. 44/14, ff. 1, 46; *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1660–1667*, p. 667; *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1666–1667*, p. 538 (Pate's petition); S. P. 44/23, p. 373 (grant), but some were vagabonds; *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1667*, p. 250.

reported that there had been an attempted insurrection of convict servants in 1663.[34] With such arguments the question must rest.

Those colonies which granted land upon a headright system kept some account of immigration among the land records. In the records of Jamaica, no enrollment of names has been preserved, but Virginia and Maryland each have registers of headrights.[35] The Virginia Land Books record only the final land patent, together with the names of those immigrants for whom it was granted. Groups of servants are thus distinguished, not by the ship upon which they came, but by the importer who paid for their passage and settled them upon the land. The Maryland Books, on the other hand, record the entry of ships, and the passengers on board, for a certificate of land was granted to the captain if he imported passengers, and no proof of settlement was required. Consequently the Maryland records are very much more satisfactory for tracing cargoes of convicts. Among the Virginia land patents, under date of July 15, 1669, may be found a grant of six thousand acres to John Pate and William Beverley, in consideration of the transportation of one hundred and twenty persons.[36] Among these are the convicts who had been granted to Pate in 1667. These convicts had arrived in Virginia before July 10, 1667, when they were mentioned in the Order Book of the Lancaster County Court. It may be seen from this instance that it is possible to trace convicts arriving in Virginia, albeit with difficulty and uncertainty. An examination of the land books up to 1675 has failed to disclose any other group which can be identified with a group of Newgate felons.

In Maryland, however, the case is different. A shipload of convicts was there registered intact upon the day they arrived, although the only way of recognizing them is by a comparison of names with lists from the Patent Rolls. The first consignment arrived on February 6, 1671/1672, and consisted of ten felons who had been excluded from Virginia by the act of 1670, and were brought over by Mr. Robert Collis in the sloop *Elizabeth*.[37] Twenty-nine persons from the 1672 pardons also came to Maryland. On May 22, 1674, Captain Benony Eaton proved his right to

[34] *Cal. St. Ps., Col., 1669–1674*, nos. 175, 178, 881; *A. P. C., Col.*, I. 553; *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia*, H. R. McIlwaine, ed. (Richmond, 1924), pp. 209–210.

[35] Bruce describes the Virginia Land Books fully.

[36] Virginia Land Patents, 1666–1678, p. 225.

[37] Maryland Land Books (at Annapolis), Liber 16, p. 409. The names are found in the pardon of June 8, 1671, Pat. Roll, C. 66/3128, no. 21. For the convicts' exclusion from Virginia see Hening's *Statutes*, II. 510–511, and Bruce, I. 606–607.

2450 acres of land for transporting forty-nine persons, and of this number thirty-five came from Newgate, having been pardoned on October 16, 1673. Similarly Captain Benjamin Cooper, on February 9, 1674/1675, registered seventy-one immigrants, of whom forty-one were from Newgate, being all with the exception of eight from the pardon of July 18, 1674. Thirty-seven more came from the lots pardoned in 1675,[38] after which Maryland passed her law forbidding the further importation of convicts. The registers indicate that this law was respected, with its renewals, for the remainder of the century.[39]

There is one further possibility of tracing the actual shipment of convicts. This is to search for evidence in the records at the Guildhall in London. There should be some traces of the bonds which merchants were required to give for safe conveyance, or some note of shipment in the court books. It is evident that after the market was closed in Virginia and Maryland the machinery of convict transportation did not work exactly as the law intended. A note in a sessions book at the Guildhall for the year 1681 reads as follows:

> Whereas Itt appeareth to this Courte That the Convicted prisoners in Newgate for some yeares past whoe have given Recognizance for transporting themselves upon his Majesties gracious Letters of pardon have not departed this kingdome according to the provisoe in the same expressed But have remayned here notwithstanding such Recognizance And committed new felonyes and offences And likewise increased their numbers As experience sheweth And alsoe by reason of the insufficiency of their manucaptors noe advantage can be taken of them Itt is therefore ordered by this Courte that the provisoe in such like pardons for Convicts be drawne and made as formerly And that the prisoners be transported by Merchants bound by obligation to his Majesty with good suretyes in A penalty with a Condicon made according to the same provisoe And that the same be made and kept by the Towne Clerke of the City of London or his deputy as antiently hath beene accustomed in whose hands the pardon is constantly kept. And by whom this Courte is to be informed of any breach of the said pardon Or of the said obligacon And whoe must certify such obligacon upon the breach of the Condicon thereof And are answerable for any miscarriage therein.

The security clause in the Newgate pardons was altered to suit this decree. Christopher Jeaffreson gave a bond of £500 to the recorder in

[38] Maryland Land Books, Liber 15, pp. 362, 390, 436; Liber 17, pp. 463, 469, 551; Liber 18, pp. 24, 84, 174. Pardons: Pat. Roll, C. 66/3137, nos. 2, 17; 66/3145, no. 2; 66/3167, no. 1; 66/3170, no. 38; 66/3173, no. 3.

[39] At the time when I saw the land books I had complete lists only of felons pardoned from Newgate, nor can it be certain that I had seen all Newgate pardons. Furthermore, it is not likely that *all* ships arriving in Maryland registered the names of their passengers. See Eugene Irving McCormac, *White Servitude in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1904), pp. 17 ff.

1684,[40] but no trace of this or any other similar bond made as a result of the court's ruling has been preserved.

There are, however, twelve recognizances of earlier dates which may be seen. They were given between 1666 and 1670, and their general nature bears out the allegations in the above note. It is recited in each, that whereas the king has pardoned this list of persons under a condition mentioned in the pardon, and whereas the above-mentioned individuals have undertaken to transport them "into the Island of Barbados or some other part of America now inhabited by the Subjects of our said" king, then if this undertaking is fulfilled and the convicts are taken to the plantation, and disposed of according to the custom of the country, that the bond is null and void. In each bond appear lists of convicts duly agreeing with the lists on the Patent Rolls.

When any considerable number of felons are named (the longest list is of forty-five names) the amount of the bond is £500. As few as ten are also taken for the same amount. For this reason the bonds seem slightly suspicious; but there is a further reason for doubting their worth, which is considerably stronger. It has been mentioned that John Pate petitioned the king, on March 1, 1666/1667, for the transportation of twenty-one convicts. These he named from a list given him by the clerk of Newgate prison, and this list was dated February 25. The petition was granted, and the pardon was issued on October 25.[41] On the 30th, Humphrey Taylor of St. Margaret's Lothbury, and Richard Taylor of Southwark gave a bond of £500 for the transportation of the convicts in the pardon of October 25, including Pate's men. But we know, beyond any doubt, that at least eight of Pate's men were in Lancaster County, Virginia, by July 10, 1667. Not only are some of the names mentioned more than once in the court record, but Pate's name is connected with theirs.[42] Thus they had been transported some months before the pardon was issued. This fact is not surprising, as they were specially granted to him by the king, but the fact that they are named in the bond given by the Taylors,

[40] Jeaffreson, *Young Squire*, II. 124.

[41] Patent Roll, C. 66/3088, no. 4.

[42] Order Book of Lancaster County, 1666–1680, *sub dat.* Three men appeared for a proof of age, and there is also this curious note: "It appeareing to this Court that George Anderton and Thomas Harwood were sent in servants into this country by Mr. John Pate, and were taken in James River on board the Kings Frigott by the Dutch men of warr, and by them sett at Libertie. It is ordered that they retorne to their said masters service and serve according to act five yeres, unlesse any order appeare out of England, and declare them free". Robert Beverley was granted a certificate for the importation of eight men on Pate's list.

seems to indicate that such bonds were written out, as a matter of "common form", soon after the issue of the pardon.

There is no further evidence worth mention respecting shipment. Convicts for transportation may be traced in the Newgate calendars, kept at the Guildhall, but there is no regular note of their shipment. They merely disappear from the calendar, with no indication of whether they died, escaped, were set free, or were transported.

A few general points must be noted in conclusion. It is a great mistake to confuse felons with political prisoners. The two classes were perfectly distinct. Our jailbirds were criminals, and their characters do not warrant whitewashing. There was not the slightest need for an aspiring colonist to commit a small crime to assure his transportation to America. Such a man would be joyfully received as an indentured servant. Nor is it true to say that their crimes were negligible according to our modern codes. It will be found that most of them were thieves, but some were convicted of more serious crimes, perhaps on doubtful evidence. It may be remarked here that no accurate idea of the criminal processes of the seventeenth century can be gained without a study of the system of pardons. The printed sessions reports,[43] issued in the later decades of the century, do not indicate the true nature of the sentences passed. For example, in eight assizes held between July, 1684, and June, 1685, ninety-two persons, according to the printed reports, were sentenced to death. An inspection of the Patent Rolls shows that of these ninety-two, thirty-three were pardoned conditionally upon their transportation, and thirteen were pardoned without condition. The same printed reports show that the judges refrained from passing sentence upon forty-four persons, reserving them for transportation, and of these three were pardoned freely, according to the Patent Roll. It is thus apparent that the lighter offenders were pardoned outright, while those whose crimes were slightly worse were pardoned for transportation. It should also be remarked that few persons could spend any period of time in the Newgate of those days without contamination. Transported convicts were definitely undesirable in the colonies, although their standard probably improved in the eighteenth century, when offenders in clergy began to be shipped.

There is little to be said concerning the convicts in the colonies.

[43] Published after each Newgate delivery, under a title beginning: *The Proceedings on the Kings Commissions of the Peace and Oyer and Terminer, and Gaol-Delivery of Newgate* . . . No further information is furnished by the manuscript sessions records. All persons pardoned were expected to plead their pardons publicly in court, at which time their names were entered on the record, but such records of pleadings seem very incomplete.

Although their exile was fixed at seven years, it does not appear that they were usually expected to remain in the status of bond servants for a time longer than that established by the custom of the country for ordinary servants. The Leeward Islands passed a law requiring eight years' servitude from transported convicts at the time of the Jeaffreson incident, but this did not become firmly established. Jamaica alone passed a law, in 1681, requiring that transported felons should serve for the term of their exile.[44] They were merged in the general population of indentured servants, and each had the opportunity which was vouchsafed to any servant to make his place in the New World.

ABBOT EMERSON SMITH.

St. Stephen's College,
Columbia University.

[44] C. O. 139/7, f. 3.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS: A FOREIGN POLICY OF INDEPENDENCE

THE Farewell Address is often thought of as an expression of abstract ideas of policy looking toward the future, but with little reference to the events of 1796. Its fundamental ideas were, on the contrary, suggested by experience, and very recent and painful experience. To comprehend Washington's point of view and feel the weight of his advice, it is necessary to consider the historical setting, and, for that, to go back to the outbreak of a general European war in February and March, 1793.

In the desperate conflict with the allied monarchies of the First Coalition the French Republic expected to find a valuable counterweight in the independent United States, separated from Great Britain by French diplomacy and arms in the previous war. Thoroughly conscious of the naval impotence of the new American nation, France had preferred not to invoke the *casus fœderis* of the treaty of alliance of 1778—the defense of the French West India Islands. A neutral United States promised greater advantages: (1) as a possible transatlantic base of operations against enemy colonies and commerce, (2) as the largest remaining neutral supply of provisions and naval stores, commodities that perhaps might be passed through the British navy under cover of the neutral flag. To finance both of these objects there was the gradually maturing American debt.

President Washington's proclamation of neutrality and the refusal of his government to lend itself to Genêt's projects soon showed France that her ally did not intend to involve itself in the European war by becoming such a base of belligerent naval and military operations. France perforce acquiesced in that decision, being still unwilling to invoke the letter of the alliance. This was because the actual belligerency of the United States which had no navy was worth nothing in itself and had the really great disadvantage of making American shipping immediately liable to capture and confiscation as enemy property. The neutrality of the United States, even though it could not serve as a base for such projects as Genêt attempted, was far more serviceable than American military assistance. The principal object of France was to secure from neutral America provisions for her beleaguered homeland and colonies, imported in American ships under protection of the prin-

ciples of the commercial treaty of 1778: free ships free goods; provisions and naval stores not contraband; neutral right to trade in non-contraband goods to and between unblockaded enemy ports.

This Franco-American treaty did not bind France's enemy, Great Britain, the principal maritime belligerent. The British had never admitted these "novel" principles. They considered them as exceptional articles in particular treaties binding only between the signatory parties. When hostilities commenced in 1793 Great Britain began seizing enemy property right and left wherever it could be found outside neutral territorial waters, whether in enemy or neutral bottoms. British prize courts under orders in council began to apply the Rule of 1756, itself an innovation as late as the Seven Years' War. Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson protested in the name of the United States against this practice, which was contrary to the articles written into the Franco-American treaty and all the other European treaties of the United States. But Great Britain was not bound by those treaties.[1] The United States was powerless to challenge the British navy. American credit, newly established, depended primarily on tariff revenue, and tariff revenue depended principally on imports from Great Britain. The collapse of credit at this time would have meant the collapse of the newly established nationality of the United States. Rather than go to war with Great Britain President Washington took Alexander Hamilton's advice and ratified Jay's Treaty with England which acquiesced in British naval practice for the next twelve years, in effect for the duration of the war.[2] That treaty did not violate the treaties of the United States with France. It recognized a condition which already existed, namely, that the United States could not compel Great Britain to observe the terms of the Franco-American treaty. In 1793 the other maritime powers, which in the War for American Independence had followed principles similar to those of the Franco-American treaty, made treaties with Great Britain agreeing to harass the commerce of France in every possible way. These powers included the old Armed Neutrals of 1780, except Sweden and Denmark. A group of ardent, hateful enemies ringed France about by land and sea to close her frontiers, to sweep her commerce from the seas, to take her colonies from her, and to deprive her of naval supplies and of foodstuffs. The neutral United States, the ally of yesteryear, which France herself had brought into the world, stood aloof and acquiesced in this British

[1] Great Britain had accepted these principles in the treaty of commerce of 1786 with France, but of course that treaty had ceased to exist with the outbreak of war.

[2] I have dwelt in detail upon the significance of this in my *Jay's Treaty* (New York, 1923).

naval-diplomatic system of strangulation. Thus were frustrated the advantages of neutral carriage which France had relied on from the American treaty of amity and commerce of 1778.

This situation was aggravated in the eyes of French statesmen by Jay's Treaty. If in the face of that document and of British practice the French were still to adhere to the terms of the American treaty, they would have to stand quietly by and watch British cruisers take French property from neutral American ships, confiscate American-owned naval stores as contraband when *en route* in American vessels to France, and preëmpt (as was the British practice) foodstuffs under similar conditions. Deprived thus by belligerent action of naval stores, foodstuffs, and of the advantages of neutral carriage they would find themselves obliged to abstain from following the British practice; they would have to watch these same goods go unchallenged by French warships into British harbors to feed and strengthen the might of the enemy.

It is not difficult to understand that this seemed unfair to France, and that Jay's Treaty seemed an outrageous, even a treacherous document, made by an ungrateful nation. But one would be more ready to sympathize with France if her own hands were clean. We must remember that when John Jay signed his famous treaty with Lord Grenville on November 19, 1794, France herself was pursuing and had been pursuing, off and on, since May 9, 1793, a maritime policy of retaliation in practice identical with that of Great Britain in the treatment of neutral shipping, and had been applying it to American ships and cargoes,[3] and that not-

[3] The various French laws and decrees affecting neutral commerce were:

May 9, 1793. Law of the National Convention decreeing orders to naval officers and commanders of privateers to bring in "neutral ships laden in whole or in part either with foodstuffs belonging to neutrals and destined to enemy ports, or with goods belonging to the enemy", the former to be purchased at the price they would have commanded at the port of their intended destination, the latter to be confiscated, and an allowance to be fixed by the prize court for freight and detention.

This act was professedly in retaliation for specified British spoliations on neutral ships, and was retroactive to all prizes brought in since the beginning of the war [which implies that some had been brought in before the occasion for "retaliation"]. Compare it with similar provisions of Article I. of the British order in council of June 8, 1793. The law of May 9 was to cease to have effect when the enemy powers should declare free and non-seizable foodstuffs which were neutral property and destined to the ports of the French Republic, as well as merchandise belonging to the French government or French citizens on board neutral ships. *Lois et actes du gouvernement* (Paris, Imprimerie Royale, 1834), VII. 51–52; the laws and decrees referred to here may also be found in the convenient *Collection complète des lois*, etc., of J. B. Duvergier, under each date. *American State Papers, Foreign Relations* (Washington, 1833), I. 377 [hereinafter cited as A.S.P., F.R., I.].

May 23, 1793. Law of the National Convention exempting American ships from the operation of the law of May 9, 1793, "conformably to Article XVI. [*sic*] of the treaty of

withstanding her obligations under her treaty with the United States. As in later European wars (1803–1812, and 1914–1917) the force of these belligerent retaliations fell heavily on the neutral United States and developed grave diplomatic problems. Unlike the later wars, in this case the United States was protected by the paper and ink of a treaty against such practice on the part of one belligerent. Nevertheless, French spoliations on American shipping rivaled those of Great Britain. French privateers and naval vessels also vied with the British in violence and outrages against neutral crews and passengers.[4]

The French diplomatic commission, headed by Joseph Fauchet, which in 1794 had succeeded the ruined Genêt in Philadelphia, did not even pretend to reconcile French maritime policy with the obligations of the treaty of commerce of 1778. Nevertheless it claimed for France all the articles of the treaty which were of advantage to her, and requested benevolent interpretations of them. The committee of public safety, in

February 6, 1778". [Article XVI. deals with the irrelevant matter of restoration of captures made by pirates. Presumably Article XXIII. was meant.] *Lois et actes,* VII. 82; A.S.P., F.R., I. 365.

May 28, 1793. Law of the National Convention repealing the law of May 23, 1793, which exempted American ships. *Lois et actes,* VII. 82–83.

July 1, 1793. Law restoring the exemption of American ships, in phraseology identical with that of May 23, 1793. *Ibid.,* VII. 174.

July 27, 1793. Law decreeing the full execution of the law of May 9, 1793, relative to neutral ships loaded with foodstuffs owned by neutrals or with enemy property. *Ibid.,* VII. 241–242.

March 24, 1794 (4 *germinal,* an II.). Law decreeing: "The treaties of navigation and of commerce existing between France and nations with whom she is at peace shall be executed according to their form and tenure." *Ibid.,* VIII. 414–415.

November 18, 1794. Decree of the committee of public safety enjoining French naval officers and commanders of privateers to enforce the law of nations and the stipulations of treaties, "conformably to the terms of the decree of the National Convention of July 27, 1793". A.S.P., F.R., I. 689, 752. This decree does not appear in the *Recueil des actes du Comité de salut public,* edited by Alphonse A. Aulard. Jay's Treaty was signed on November 19, 1794.

[4] In addition to an undetermined number of captures at sea, Fulwar Skipwith, American claims agent at Paris in October, 1794, stated that there were nearly 300 vessels in the ports of France suffering from embargoes (a later list showed that the Bordeaux embargo accounted for 103 cases), spoliations, delays, breaches of contract, non-payment of purchased cargoes, etc. The United States Court of Claims, which completed adjudication of the French Spoliation Claims for 1793–1800 (responsibility having been assumed by the convention with France of 1800) awarded a total of $7,149,306.10 for 1853 authentic cases of spoliation. Each case did not, however, represent a particular ship. Congress has appropriated to date only $3,910,860.61, to pay part of these claims. To this may be added $5,000,000 for claims of a special character, assumed by the United States in 1803, in part payment for Louisiana—to wit: embargoes, detention and appropriation of goods in French harbors, money due from the French government for purchases, etc.

drawing up instructions for these commissioners, anticipated that there would be objections in the United States to the retaliatory French decrees. Admitting deviations from the treaty it became the task of the commissioners to extenuate French policy on the ground of altered circumstances.[5]

Washington and his advisers had foreseen the possible further effect on France of the intended treaty between the United States and Great Britain when John Jay, the Federalist, pro-British diplomatist departed on his famous mission to London. To mask this mission they sent to France the pro-French Republican senator from Virginia, James Monroe, an old opponent of Jay's diplomacy since 1786, who considered Jay's mission as mischievous and in the Senate voted against his confirmation. Monroe never saw Jay's instructions, possibly was not aware of their real scope.

Like an apostle of the rights of man, Monroe set to work to persuade the French government to observe the treaty of amity and commerce of 1778. The restrictions on private trade in French harbors, the embargoes, the delays in payment for purchased cargoes, had already so jeopardized the American provision supply that the Convention admitted the force of the American remonstrances on every point except free ships free goods.[6] The envoy now argued for the full and entire enforcement of the articles of the treaty. He appealed to old friendship and present interest. He contended that it would be good policy for France to repeal her obnoxious decrees before Great Britain should repeal hers. If she did so, it would combine all America in condemnation of the conduct of the British; if she did not, any later repeal would appear merely to be forced by her enemy. At just this time news arrived[7] of the setting aside, by an order in council of August 6, 1794, of the British provision order of June 8, 1793—this had been a means in London of easing the English negotiations with Jay. It reënforced Monroe's argument in Paris. The French law of May 9, 1793, had made the duration of the "retaliatory" maritime measures contingent upon the repeal by the enemy of his illegal procedure. The Convention now (January 2, 1795) availed itself of this provision to yield to the importunities of the ingratiating James Monroe. "As a grand act of honesty and justice", it wiped out at one stroke all the offensive decrees and enjoined the strict observance of

[5] *Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791–1797*, Frederick J. Turner, ed., in *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association, 1903, II. 291.

[6] A.S.P., F.R., I. 677.

[7] See report of Merlin de Douai, brumaire, an III., Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères, Correspondance politique, États-Unis, vol. 42, ff. 186–204.

the provisions of the treaty of 1778.[8] Orders were immediately given for the adjudication of all claims arising out of violations of that treaty.

Monroe's triumph was short-lived. Before anything very effective could actually be done about the relief of the claimants the significance of Jay's Treaty[9] began to be suspected in Paris. In August, 1795, the text arrived from Philadelphia. It completely undid Monroe's successes. In 1796 Washington recalled the unhappy minister for not having defended with sufficient vigor the new English treaty.[10] In truth Monroe had repeated to the French government the arguments and defenses sent to him by Secretaries of State Randolph and Pickering. They read well, but one may doubt that his heart was in his words. He thought Jay's Treaty a shameful document.[11] There is evidence suggesting that he had confidential conversations with the French Revolutionary leaders about "the real dispositions of his countrymen", conversations which he did not reveal to his own government.[12] He kept up an intimate correspondence with Madison,[13] and other friends of Jefferson, who opposed Jay's Treaty

[8] Law of 13 nivôse, an III., *Bulletin des lois de la République française*, 1e sér., vol. III., no. 107; decree of the committee of public safety, 14 nivôse, an. III. (Jan. 3, 1795), A.S.P., F.R., I. 642 [in English translation; not in Aulard].

[9] *Before* the repeal of the retaliatory decrees the committee had asked Monroe about the treaty; and he had conveyed to them information from Jay, to the effect that it contained nothing contrary to the existing treaties of the United States; and had promised that as soon as he might be informed of its contents he would inform the committee. This promise impelled Monroe to refuse to accept from Jay a *confidential* statement of the contents of the treaty. Monroe's *View of the Conduct of the Executive on the Foreign Affairs of the United States, connected with the Mission to the French Republic during the Years 1794, 5, and 6* (Philadelphia, 1797), pp. xvii–xxvii.

[10] Monroe's instructions and dispatches are printed in A.S.P., F.R., I., and in his exculpatory *View*. Washington's studied comments on the *View*, written at Mount Vernon on the margin of its pages, are printed in appendix II. to Daniel C. Gilman's *James Monroe* (Boston, 1883, 1898). Beverley W. Bond, jr.'s The Monroe Mission to France, 1794–1796, in The Johns Hopkins *Studies in Historical and Political Science*, XXV. (1907) 9–103, did not have available the valuable sources in the French ministry of foreign affairs. The various deliberations of committees on Monroe's notes, and relevant reports, quite voluminous, are in Arch. Aff., Étr., États-Unis, vol. 42, particularly ff. 17, 141, 186–204.

[11] Monroe to Joseph Jones, Sept. 15, 1795. Calendar, in Division of MSS. of the Library of Congress, of the Gouverneur Collection of Monroe Papers, now privately owned. Gilman, p. 62, printed a portion of this letter.

[12] Monroe wrote to the committee of public safety a "non-official letter", December 27, 1794, asking that a member of the committee be deputed to have frank conversations with him concerning any propositions about to be made to the American government "on this subject [*i.e.*, possible propositions] or any other (if you desire) tending to acquaint you [the committees] with the situation and the *real* dispositions of my *countrymen* [italics inserted]. Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 42, f. 445.

[13] *Writings of James Monroe*, Stanislaus Murray Hamilton, ed. (New York, 1898–1903), vol. II., *passim*.

and favored a pro-French policy. He certainly led the French government to believe that any treaty of amity between the United States and Great Britain would never be ratified.[14] When it was known that a treaty had been signed, Monroe repeated this assurance.[15] When Jay's Treaty went through Congress he tried rather lamely to explain its success, and still argued that it would be good policy for the French Republic to observe loyally the terms of its American treaties; the example of that loyalty and the contrasting attitude of the British government would win the good will of the American *people,* from whose eyes the scales of British deception must eventually fall.[16] He led them in Paris to believe that the people would overthrow the administration of President Washington as a result of the treaty, that better things might be expected after the election of 1796.[17] This supposition was reënforced by advice from the French diplomatic representative in the United States, Fauchet, and his successor Adet, and by Americans in Paris like Monroe's friend, Tom Paine.

After Jay's departure from New York Fauchet had become increasingly nervous about the object of the new mission. He sent one of his colleagues to Paris to warn the committee of public safety that something was in the air, and to say that the other two members of the commission, La Forest and Petry, could not be trusted because they hobnobbed with Alexander Hamilton and other Federalists.[18] When news of the signature of the treaty and rumors of its contents began to leak out, the French minister became very much exasperated. His notes of protest against fancied violations of neutral obligations under the treaty of 1778 took on a more rasping tone, full of intimations of American disloyalty. Fauchet tried by fair means and foul, but in vain, to block

[14] Adet to the committee of public safety, 14 thermidor, an III. (Aug. 1, 1795), *Corr. Fr. Min.*, p. 762.

[15] "I assured them, generally, as I had done before, that I was satisfied the treaty contained in it nothing which could give them uneasiness; but if it did, and especially if it weakened our connexion with France, it would certainly be disapproved in America." Monroe to the Secretary of State, Apr. 14, 1795, A.S.P., F.R., I. 702. He did convey to the committee of public safety Jay's only statement to him about the treaty, that it contained nothing contrary to the treaty stipulations of the United States with other countries.

[16] "Exposé sommaire", etc., dated 1796, in the Monroe Collection of MSS., Library of Congress. Internal evidence proves Monroe to be the writer, and one presumes from the same evidence that it was directed to the French government, although I have not found it in the French archives.

[17] Monroe to the minister of foreign affairs, Paris, Feb. 17, 1796 (28 pluviôse, an IV.), Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 45, f. 146.

[18] *Corr. Fr. Min.*, pp. 373, 389, 410, 419; Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 41, ff. 291, 377, 408.

the ratification of the treaty by the Senate. He hoped with Secretary Randolph that the President might not sign the ratification, even though the Senate had so advised and consented. His successor Adet, encouraged by the widespread popular protests, labored with the House of Representatives to refuse the appropriations necessary to carry it into effect. When the treaty passed unscathed through the House, Adet's last hope was that the people would overthrow the administration of President Washington in the forthcoming election of 1796.[19] Through the agency of organs of the Republican press which he manipulated and inspired to the extent of his limited financial resources, and by means of the democratic societies which had arisen at the wave of Genêt's wand to applaud the French Revolution, the French minister was working with might and main to that end.[20] He did not know, of course, of the President's determination, long since fixed and presently to be announced, to refuse a third term.

In Paris, American affairs had received less attention than they merited. Before the reorganization of the French government under the constitution of the Year III. (1795) the rapidly changing administration of the foreign office failed to give methodical attention. French diplomatists at Philadelphia complained bitterly that their dispatches went unanswered. For months they waited without instructions. None of them had been told what to do about Jay's Treaty. Fauchet, and his successor Adet, had acted on their own responsibility in their protests against that instrument. The new Directory put the conduct of foreign affairs on a more businesslike basis, under a single minister, Charles Delacroix. He straightway brought in a report concerning the United States. Washington must go, he said. "A friend of France must succeed him in that eminent office." He continued:

> We must raise up the people and at the same time conceal the lever by which we do so . . . I propose to the Executive Directory to authorize me to send orders and instructions to our minister plenipotentiary at Philadelphia

[19] *Corr. Fr. Min.*, p. 894. Neither Fauchet and the commissioners, nor their successor Adet, had any actual instructions concerning Jay's Treaty. Once they left Paris, they received scant attention from the committee of public safety.

[20] Bernard Faÿ, *L'esprit révolutionnaire en France et aux États-Unis à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1925), pp. 254–260. "All these intrigues are sad and displeasing to study when one remembers the sincere enthusiasm which the masses of the American people then testified for France." *Ibid.*, p. 255. John Bach McMaster, *History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1883–1913), vol. II., ch. IX., is in effect a digest of opposing press and pamphlet comment. The arguments of the Republican press against Jay's Treaty, against Washington, against the Farewell Address, and finally against the candidacy of John Adams, reflect the paragraphs of the political correspondence of the French foreign office with its American legation.

to use all the means in his power in the United States to bring about the right kind of revolution (*l'heureuse Révolution*) and Washington's replacement, which, assuring to the Americans their independence, will break off treaties [*sic*] made with England and maintain those which unite them to the French Republic.

As in the case of the Netherlands at that time, France and French agents regarded that political party in the United States which was most useful to their purposes as the "patriot" party. Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Robert R. Livingston, Senator Tazewell of Virginia, Governor Clinton of New York, and Governor Mifflin of Pennsylvania were patriots. Washington, Hamilton, Jay, Rufus King, and John Adams were aristocrats unfriendly to real liberty. The French foreign office looked on the United States as "the Holland of the New World". It hoped for and expected a popular revolution there, on French models, such as did take place in Holland in 1795, to overturn the existing régime of ordered liberty, to cast off the formidable ascendency of President Washington and his Federalist advisers who themselves were esteemed to be beyond the reach of French influence and purpose.[21]

At first the Directory decided on a more positive step to offset Jay's Treaty: to send a special envoy extraordinary to Philadelphia to recall Adet and to announce the end of the Franco-American treaties and then himself to withdraw.[22] Monroe confidentially urged Delacroix against such action: it would please the enemies of both countries. "Left to ourselves", he hinted, "everything will I think be satisfactorily arranged and *perhaps in the course of the present year:* and it is always more grateful to make such arrangements ourselves than to be pressed to it."[23]

Delacroix[24] and the Directory took the advice of President Washington's minister to await the President's overthrow. They blamed Washington, Hamilton, and the Federalist Senate, in short the elected government of the people of the United States, against which, accord-

[21] To this point there is a remarkable analysis of American politics in relation to French policy, by the undersecretary of the sixth division of the foreign office: Memoir on the United States, Florida, and Louisiana, 12 frimaire, an IV. (Dec. 3, 1795). Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 44, ff. 407–417.

[22] Report of the minister of foreign affairs to the Executive Directory, 27 nivôse, an IV. (Jan. 17, 1796), *ibid.*, vol. 45, ff 41–53.

[23] Monroe to the minister of foreign affairs, Paris, Feb. 17, 1796 (28 pluviôse, an IV.), *ibid.*, vol. 45, f. 147 [italics inserted]. This highly significant note was not revealed to his own government and is enough to justify Washington's removal of Monroe. Monroe summarized the arguments he had made to Delacroix in a letter to the Secretary of State of February 20, 1796, but made no reference to any written note of his and said nothing about the hint he had given.

[24] Delacroix to Monroe, Paris, 1 ventôse, an IV. (Feb. 20, 1796), *ibid.*, vol 45, f. 160.

ing to French agents and correspondents (including Americans in Paris), the people were now in an uproar, from Boston to Savannah. Well they knew that Monroe's hint referred to the approaching presidential election of 1796.[25] They decided to temporize, to protest, to argue (Monroe had advised them not to abandon their claims for redress), pending the new presidential election, to work up "patriot" sentiment against Washington's administration. To this effect they approved instructions to a new minister.[26] Later came news of the success of Jay's Treaty in the House of Representatives. They then decided not to send any new minister after all, but to keep Adet in Philadelphia for a short while at least, and to follow his advice, and that of the returned Fauchet, to hearten the pro-French "patriots" in America by an unmistakable denunciation of the policy of the executive of the United States, lest by French silence the election should go in Washington's favor.

The inveterate tendency of French policy to stir up the American people against their government had gradually steeled the sympathies of President Washington against the old ally. Though Washington could not know the inner counsels of the French Directory—least of all when he had a minister like Monroe in Paris—the policy of France had been made abundantly apparent by the French diplomatists in Philadelphia. Since Genêt's time they had been openly or covertly attempting to join forces with the anti-Federalist opposition. They had been able to promise themselves much from such strategy because of radical political affinities and because of the memory of French help in the American Revolution. But the French alliance, indispensable as it was to American independence, had always been a great embarrassment to American diplomatists. It was so even during the diplomacy of the Revolution itself, when Vergennes had wavered under the threats of a separate Spanish peace (though his wavering has become known only to scholars in our own day). It was so during the peace negotiations of 1782 in Paris. Experience with it showed the Fathers the danger to independence and sovereignty of any other alliance. Toward the close of the war Congress shrank from committing itself to the Dutch proposal to join the Armed Neutrality. In 1786 John Jay's initialed alliance with Spain

[25] Observations on Mr. Monroe's letter to the minister of foreign affairs, not dated, *ibid.*, vol. 45, f. 148.

[26] "Memoir of Political Instructions to the Citizen Vincent, to be sent as Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic to the United States". *Recueil des actes du Directoire exécutif*, A. Debidour, ed. (Paris, 1910), I. 748; II. 621. Some charges against Vincent's integrity apparently stopped his departure. Later Monroe's protest against the appointment of Mangourit, the former French consul at Charleston during Genêt's obnoxious operations, was effective.

(never revealed fully until the twentieth century) collapsed before the opposition of the Southern states who feared for the Mississippi. Soon after, the South united with New England (anxious about its fisheries)[27] and wrote into the Constitution that potent provision that no future treaty could be ratified except by the vote of two-thirds of the senators present in the upper chamber of the national legislature, that Senate in which there must always be exactly two senators from each state. To a certain degree this fixed a constitutional obstacle against European entanglements. More than one delegate supported it for that reason.[28]

The French alliance had become increasingly embarrassing after the French declaration of war on England, February 1, 1793. The proclamation of neutrality was a tangible expression of a sane American policy not of isolation but of diplomatic independence. Washington refused all new foreign alliances. As Hamilton so indiscreetly told the British minister, Hammond, in 1794, he rejected the Swedish invitation to join the second, abortive, armed neutrality of 1794. He also turned down Godoy's famous "propositions for the President", of that same year, for a Spanish alliance, as Pinckney too later repelled them in Madrid. In short, the very life-saving French alliance had long since cured the United States of any hankering for more allies.

The first twenty years of American independence had in fact made American statesmen shy of Europe, and they have remained so ever since. Their writings (with the possible exception of James Monroe, whose name after 1823 was to become so inseparably associated with abstention from European politics and wars!) are full of affirmations that it was the true policy of the United States to steer clear of European politics.[29]

Tom Paine had been the first to express this, in 1776. "'Tis the true interest of America, to steer clear of European contentions, which she never can do, while by her dependance on Britain, she is made the make-weight in the scale of British politics."[30] "I do not love to be entangled in the politics of Europe", wrote John Adams in 1777.[31] In the Virginia ratifying convention in 1788, Madison, speaking for the adoption of the

[27] R. Earl McClendon published a useful note on the Origin of the Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action upon Treaties, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI. 768–772.

[28] J. Fred Rippy and Angie Debo, The Historical Background of the American Policy of Isolation, *Smith College Studies in History*, vol. IX., nos. 3 and 4 (Apr.-July, 1924), p. 140.

[29] Rippy and Debo, *op. cit.*, have collected numerous expressions of abstention from European politics.

[30] *Common Sense* (Philadelphia, 1776, 1st ed.), p. 38.

[31] Rippy and Debo, p. 90.

new Federal Constitution asked: "What is the situation of America?" and answered, "She is remote from Europe, and ought not to engage in her politics or wars."[32] Jefferson in France had written in 1787: "I know too that it is a maxim with us, and I think it a wise one, not to entangle ourselves with the affairs of Europe."[33] Again, in 1790: "At such a distance from Europe, and with such an ocean between us, we hope to meddle little in its quarrels or combinations. Its peace and its commerce are what we shall court . . ."[34] Hamilton repeatedly had used words almost identical with essential portions of the text of Washington's Farewell Address of 1796.[35] So had the President, particularly in 1795.[36]

If George Washington had retired from the presidency in the spring of 1793,[37] as he originally intended when he first consulted James Madison about the draft of a valedictory we may presume that he would never have said anything about foreign affairs. There would have been no Farewell Address of the kind that has become so familiar to us—though we cannot say that the policy itself would not soon have been formulated. Certainly Washington's suggestions, and Madison's draft, for a possible valedictory in 1792, did not touch foreign affairs. In the summer of

[32] *The Writings of James Madison,* Gaillard Hunt, ed. (New York, 1900–1910), V. 151.

[33] *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* Paul Leicester Ford, ed. (New York, 1892–1899), IV. 483.

[34] To Monsieur de Pinto, New York, Aug. 7, 1790. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* Memorial ed. (Washington, 1903–1904), VIII. 74.

[35] Over the signature of *Horatius,* arguing for the ratification of Jay's Treaty, Hamilton wrote in 1795: "If you consult your true interest your motto cannot fail to be: 'PEACE AND TRADE WITH ALL NATIONS; beyond our present engagements, POLITICAL CONNECTION WITH NONE.' You ought to spurn from you as the box of Pandora, the fatal heresy of a close alliance, or in the language of *Genet,* a true *family compact,* with France. This would at once make you a mere satellite of France, and entangle you in all the contests, broils, and wars of Europe." The text continues: "'Tis evident that the controversies of Europe must often grow out of causes and interests foreign to this country. Why then should we, by a close political connection with any power of Europe, expose our peace and interest, as a matter of course, to all the shocks with which their mad rivalship and wicked ambition so frequently convulse the earth? 'T were insanity to embrace such a system." *The Works of Alexander Hamilton,* Henry Cabot Lodge, ed. (New York, 1885–1886), IV. 366–367.

[36] To Patrick Henry, Oct. 9, 1795; to Gouverneur Morris, Dec. 22, 1795; *The Writings of George Washington,* Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed. (New York, 1889–1893), XIII. 119, 151. Washington refused to lend his official intercession to assist the release from Austrian and Prussian prisons of his dearest friend, Lafayette, for fear of involving the United States in Europe's wars. See my article in *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine,* vol. LVIII., nos. 6, 7, and 8 (June, July, August, 1924).

[37] I have profited from discussions of President Washington's policies with Mr. Frank Louraine of Washington, D. C., particularly on the significance of the Farewell Address in 1796, instead of 1792.

1796, however, foreign affairs were uppermost in the mind of the Father of His Country. Then unalterably resolved not to serve another term, he prepared to indite a final message to the American people at large.

It was to remove foreign interference in our domestic affairs, to preserve the nation and the people from Europe's distresses, that the retiring first President, with a particular eye to relations with France, marked out for his now private adviser, Alexander Hamilton, the subjects which he would like to include in his final address. In characteristically familiar and felicitous phrases—many of which we may find already expressed in the *Federalist* and other products of his pen—Hamilton wrote out the President's ideas.[38] Of Washington were the trunk and branches of the sturdy tree. The shimmering foliage dancing and shining in the sunlight was Hamilton's. The President edited several drafts before the address was finished. He cast out at least one extraneous thought which Hamilton tried gratuitously to slip in. Despite Hamilton's principal part in the phrasing of the document, and his previous expression of some of the ideas, we may be sure that in the final text the two men were thinking together in absolute unison. The Address was as directly pointed to the diplomatic problems of the time of the French Revolution as were Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points to the intricate diplomacy of the World War. President Wilson and Colonel House worked no more intimately together on that document in 1918, drafting and redrafting its clauses, than did President Washington and Colonel Hamilton in 1796, composing and recomposing the paragraphs of the Farewell Address.

The immortal document, ever since a polestar of American foreign policy, represented the crystallization of the experience of remarkably clear-headed men with foreign affairs since the Declaration of Independence. It was given forthwith to the public in a newspaper.[39] It spoke directly to the great and simple audience of the American people. "The name of AMERICAN", it said to them, putting the word into bold type, "which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appelation derived from local discriminations."

We must keep in mind the involvement of the French alliance in American diplomacy and domestic politics as we read the Farewell Ad-

[38] Horace Binney in one of the first critical essays in American historiography analyzed the authorship of the document. *An Inquiry into the Formation of Washington's Farewell Address* (Philadelphia, 1859).

[39] *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* (Philadelphia), Sept. 19, 1796.

dress, even as the authors of the document had that constantly before them.

It began thus with an appeal to support the *National Union*. The orthodox phrase Federal Union does not occur in the document, a very significant omission. It continued with a counsel against the practice of party politics, lest the new nation be undermined by internal dissension assisted by foreign intrigue. The first President and his adviser Alexander Hamilton believed that, with the system of checks and balances in the new government, party politics was unnecessary for the preservation of ordered liberty. The rise of an opposition they identified with a faction opposed not only to the policies of the administration but to the new national government itself. They connected this faction with the French government and its agents.

Turning to the subject of foreign affairs, the Address admonished his fellow citizens to steer clear of European alliances and wars. It justified American neutrality whilst the nation, assisted by the advantages of so peculiar a situation, might grow strong enough to command its own fortune. In these words and these counsels the authors of the Address had continually before them the apparition of the life-giving, but the entangling French alliance, and the distant scene of the great wars engulfing Europe. They had behind them the problems solved by Jay's Treaty and by Pinckney's Treaty, thanks to the occupation of Britain and Spain with those troubles in Europe.

The immediate purpose of the Address was to strike a powerful blow against French intermeddling in American affairs.[40] After the victory of Jay's Treaty in the House of Representatives it had been Adet's advice, and this was also recommended by the returned Fauchet,[41] that some strong and positive action ought to be taken to make the American ally more amenable to French interests. The people, both of those agents had reported—and reported most voluminously—were in favor of France and opposed to their government, but if France did not call

[40] Inclosing the document, Adet reported: "It would be useless to speak to you about it. You will have noticed the lies it contains, the insolent tone that governs it, the immorality which characterizes it. You will have had no difficulty in recognizing the author of a piece extolling ingratitude, showing it as a virtue necessary to the happiness of States, presenting interest as the only counsel which governments ought to follow in the course of their negotiations, putting aside honor and glory. You will have recognized immediately the doctrine of the former Secretary of the Treasury, Hamilton, and the principles of loyalty that have always directed the Philadelphia Government." *Corr. Fr. Min.*, p. 954.

[41] See Fauchet's long Memoir on the United States of America, 24 frimaire, an IV. (Dec. 15, 1795), Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 44, ff. 457–529.

Washington's government to terms, and thus support the action of the "good" people to overthrow it, nothing could be hoped from them. Adet advocated [42] that the French Republic proceed to treat American ships precisely as the United States government allowed its flag to be treated by Great Britain, that is, according to the principles of Jay's Treaty. This was, indeed, what France had been doing up to January 3, 1795, when Monroe secured from the Convention the full and entire recognition of the treaty of 1778. But that "grand act of honesty and justice" had not been enforced since the nature of Jay's Treaty had become suspected in France. Nor was it ever to be. It was to be the United States government itself which was finally to pay—throughout a century of litigation—most of the damages to its citizens wrought by the French spoliations in this war.

Jay's Treaty at last having gone into effect, the French Directory prepared its denunciation of the treachery of Washington's government. As a warning to the American people of worse things to follow if President Washington were continued in office it decided to suspend Adet's functions, and with them formal diplomatic relations with the United States. Characterizing Jay's Treaty as equivalent to an alliance between France's principal enemy and her old, ungrateful ally, it proceeded to invoke against American shipping, as a reprisal for that perfidious treaty, the maritime principles of that document itself.[43] If Jefferson should be elected the plan was to restore relations on the old basis, hoping that a new treaty with France might undo Jay's.[44]

To his great satisfaction Adet was able to communicate to the United States government, on October 27, 1796, the text of a decree of the Directory announcing that "All neutral or allied Powers shall, without delay, be notified that the flag of the French republic will treat neutral vessels, either as to confiscation, as to searches, or capture, in the same manner as they shall suffer the English to treat them." [45]

A few weeks later (November 15) he announced the definite suspension of his functions, not, indeed, to indicate a formal rupture between

[42] *Corr. Fr. Min.*, pp. 900–906.

[43] The minister of foreign affairs to Adet, 7 fructidor, an IV. (Aug. 24, 1796), Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vol. 46, ff. 144–145. See also drafts and reports associated with these instructions, *ibid.*, ff. 133–140.

[44] Same to same, 12 brumaire, an V. (Nov. 2, 1796), *ibid.*, ff. 355–358.

[45] Translation of an extract from the resolves of the Directory, of the 14th messidor, an IV. (July 2, 1796). A.S.P., F.R., I. 577. This extract is not printed in the proceedings for that date of the *Actes du Directoire exécutif.*

the United States and France, "but as a mark of just discontent, which is to last until the government of the United States returns to sentiments, and to measures, more conformable to the interests of the alliance, and the sworn friendship of the two nations".

It was now the eve of the presidential election of 1796. The several states were choosing their electors. They still had to meet and cast their votes. The precedent had not yet become set which allows the electors no canvass or deliberation among themselves. The French move was studiously calculated to influence the electors to choose Jefferson instead of John Adams.[46] With this in mind, according to his instructions, Adet accompanied his announcement of suspension of his functions with a long and *ex-parte* review (with documents) of the whole quarrel between France and the United States over American neutrality. He included a passionate indictment of Jay's Treaty, all under cover of a fervid manifesto to the American people. A summary in English of the contents of this note appeared in the newspapers before the translation of the French original could be prepared in the Department of State. "Let your Government return to itself", wrote Adet, addressing the people rather than the government to which his note was delivered, "and you will still find in Frenchmen faithful friends and generous allies."[47]

To that uncompromising Federalist, Timothy Pickering, old soldier, negotiator of Indian treaties, professional and capable officeholder, and general utility man in Washington's cabinet, now fell the task of defending the foreign policy laid down in the Farewell Address. Four others had declined the proffered appointment of Secretary of State, with its meager emolument, before he took it. Though Pickering had no special training for the office, he was a facile penman and a sharp-minded debater. These were the qualifications principally in demand from 1795 to 1800.

Space only forbids us to describe and to analyze Pickering's defense of American neutrality, of Jay's Treaty with England, in short of the foreign policy of George Washington. We may be sure that it was inspired by Alexander Hamilton,[48] the man who inspired Jay's Treaty, and who phrased the Farewell Address. The remarkable public disputation took the form of instructions to Charles C. Pinckney, dated January

[46] *Corr. Fr. Min.*, p. 972.

[47] A.S.P., F.R., I. 583.

[48] See Hamilton to Wolcott, Nov. 22, 1796, George Gibbs, *Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and John Adams, edited from the papers of Oliver Wolcott* (New York, 1846), I. 398.

16, 1797, who had already sailed to France as successor to the recalled Monroe; but its real purpose, as shown by its immediate release to the press on January 19, 1797,[49] was to serve as a counter-manifesto to Adet's passionate attacks on the administration and his undercover efforts to secure the election of Thomas Jefferson rather than John Adams, the champion of Washington's policies. The historian to-day who is privileged to read the archives of France and of the United States can have no serious quarrel with Pickering's eloquent rebuttal of French charges of American ingratitude directed against Washington's government, nor with his blunt conclusion after a long review that France owed fully as much to the United States as the United States to France in the way of service rendered. The day for finesse had passed. It was time that some one put the truth in this way to the American people, at a moment when foreign diplomacy was again trying to reach over the heads of their government to whip them into European complications. Even then in 1795 and 1796 while French diplomatists were accusing the United States of ingratitude and treachery, they themselves were plotting to reëstablish control and tutelage over the American republic by getting Louisiana and West Florida back from Spain, allying France with the southwestern Indians, and tempting the allegiance to the Union of the new western states, to build up thereby a new colonial empire that would be the preponderant power in the New World.[50]

The instructions to C. C. Pinckney,[51] embodying these arguments, rank with Jefferson's rejoinder to Hammond of 1792, with John Quincy Adams's defense of General Jackson's execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister in 1818, and with Lansing's reply to Austria in 1915 on the question of contraband, as one of the greatest defensive documents in the diplomatic history of the United States. Pickering's paper clinched the case for President Washington's foreign policy.

Before the document was printed the presidential electors had elected John Adams President by a majority of one vote and a margin of three votes over Thomas Jefferson, who became Vice President according to the original constitutional provision. Washington's successor fully recognized that the significance of his election lay in the question whether the American people were to govern themselves or be governed by

[49] It was transmitted to Congress on January 19, 1797, and immediately ordered to be printed. It appeared in the *Aurora* in installments between January 24 and February 3, 1797.

[50] Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, vols. 39–42.

[51] A.S.P., F.R., I. 559–576.

foreign nations.[52] As President he took over Washington's policies, and, to his later vexation, his entire cabinet.

We cannot conclude that Pickering's instructions to Pinckney decided the election. It had been won already. The dispatch was published after the votes of the electors had been announced on the first Wednesday in January, but before they were formally counted on the first Wednesday in February. The document was rather an appeal to the people to support the foreign policy of Washington—and of Hamilton—and an argument to open the door to an escape from the French alliance, by proving, as Hamilton suggested, that the United States had maintained good faith with its engagements; that if the conduct of the other party released it, the release should not be refused, so far as possible without compromising peace. "This idea is very important", Hamilton wrote to Wolcott, of course for Pickering's benefit.[53]

Despite the high hopes which France had placed on Jefferson's election, both John Adams and his close contestant, the new Vice President, Thomas Jefferson, were equally good Americans (albeit of different political philosophy), and, incidentally, almost equally good friends of France. Nor were they unfriendly to each other. Jefferson had gone so far as to authorize his friend Madison to advise electors, in case of a tie, to vote for Adams as a statesman of senior claims to the presidency.[54] Adet came to sense this relationship before he left. He wrote:[55]

> Mr. Jefferson likes us because he detests England; he seeks to draw near to us because he fears us less than England; but tomorrow he might change his opinion about us if England should cease to inspire his fear. Although Jefferson is the friend of liberty and of science, although he is an admirer of the efforts we have made to cast off our shackles and to clear away the cloud of ignorance which weighs down the human race, Jefferson, I say, is an American, and as such, he cannot sincerely be our friend. An American is the born enemy of all the peoples of Europe.

Such was the historical setting of the famous Farewell Address. Such were the reasons for its pronouncement in 1796, so different a pronouncement from what it would have been if given to the people in 1792. Such was its victory over foreign intrigue within our own country. It did not disown the French alliance, but it taught a patronizing ally that

[52] In his Inaugural Address he said: "If the control of an election can be obtained by foreign nations by flattery or menaces, by fraud or violence, by terror, intrigue, or venality, the Government may not be the choice of the American people, but of foreign nations. It may be foreign nations who govern us, and not we, the people, who govern ourselves."

[53] Nov. 22, 1796, Gibbs, I. 400.

[54] Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, IV. 173.

[55] *Corr. Fr. Min.*, p. 983.

we were an independent and a sovereign nation, and that the French Republic could not use in America the tool that had been so successful with the border satellite states in Europe, the lever of a political opposition to overthrow any government that stood in the way of French policy, purpose, and interest. In Washington's time avoidance of foreign alliances and of foreign entanglement was a question of independence and national sovereignty. What we have generally construed as a policy of "isolation" we ought really to interpret as a policy of vigilant defense and maintenance of sovereign national independence against foreign meddling in our own intimate domestic concerns.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

The George Washington University.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

Seventh International Congress of Historical Sciences
Warsaw, August 21–28, 1933

The Seventh International Congress of Historical Sciences, held at Warsaw last August, was the best attended of all the meetings of the congress since its organization and, according to the old-timers, one of the best in every way. There were, probably, reasons for this extraneous to the congress itself. The historians, as historians, were desirous of seeing first-hand this newly resurrected nation, perhaps with some curiosity as to what kind of a host it would make to so critical and distinguished an international body. The location of the congress in the east of Europe, close to Russia, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, and Italy, making travel less expensive, increased the attendance. The large numbers of Italians and French and the prominent rôles they played at the congress were due, one felt, not simply to scientific interest. The Italians wished to show what they were doing in the realm of historical science, to demonstrate that both in quantity and quality their historical output could vie with that of the leading scientific peoples of Europe, and the demonstration was very convincing. France, on the other hand, was undoubtedly influenced by the desire to give all possible aid to her good friend Poland in the international house party. The party was a grand success and the host must have experienced a profound feeling of satisfaction, when the last guest had departed, that Poland had redeemed in such a brilliant way, in the midst of so great an economic depression, an invitation given in the midst of increasing prosperity. The one fly in the ointment—not visible to the superficial observer—was the comparatively small attendance of the Germans and the inadequate part they played at the congress, the number of papers they presented being less than half as many as those offered by Poland, France, or Italy. But Poland was a perfect host and nothing occurred—at least nothing that I noticed—to remind one of the skeleton in the closet. The German was a perfect guest.

Poland entertained the guests on a royal scale. The series of dinners and receptions began Sunday evening, the members of the congress being welcomed to Warsaw by the Polish Historical Society in the salons of the *Cercle de Commerce;* on Monday evening, they were invited to a formal reception—evening dress and *décorations*—at the *Palais de la Présidence,* to meet the Prime Minister; on Tuesday evening,

the Mayor of Warsaw kept open house at the *Hôtel de Ville;* on Wednesday evening, came the great banquet of the congress, where scholars from distant lands rubbed elbows, at the *Dolina Szwajcarska,* with picture-taking and speeches by representatives of the different nations; on Friday evening, the members of the congress were guests at the *Teatr Narodwy,* where the "Wesele" of Wyspianski was given, and on Saturday evening, the festivities came to a climax in a brilliant reception at the Royal Palace, where the members of the congress were received by the distinguished scientist, Professor Ignace Mościcki, President of the Republic. It was an impressive scene in a beautiful setting and M. Mościcki, the center of a great gathering in a vast salon, appeared a worthy successor to the kings of Poland. He looked the rôle.

The ladies of the congress not only shared in all these festivities, but were entertained in addition at *goûters,* luncheons, and teas, were shown many interesting social institutions in and around Warsaw, and were charmed both by the personalities of their hostesses and by their refined and lavish hospitality. Many international friendships were formed at these gatherings. On Sunday, the congress went tc the beautiful old city of Krakow where the concluding session was held on Monday morning in the aula of the University of Krakow. It was a fitting ending for a memorable congress.

The sessions of the congress in Warsaw were held in the halls and lecture rooms of the Polytechnicum, a large and impressive building—four stories, centrally located. The opening session, one of two general sessions in Warsaw, was held in the aula, a great court in the center of the building, four stories high, surmounted by a glass dome and surrounded on each floor by galleries. A monumental staircase descended from the entrance into the aula. More suggestive of a hall of legislation than of an aula for university convocations, it was, nevertheless, a superb place for the opening session of the International Congress of Historical Sciences. The session appealed more to the eye than to the ear, for the hall was too large for the ordinary human voice and when the loudspeakers were turned on, the last state was worse than the first. After the congress was seated, the President of the Republic entered the hall, descended the great staircase with his suite, and took a seat on the floor, facing the presiding officer. A military *attaché* stood behind him during the entire session.

After this opening session, the congress did not meet again as a body until Sunday morning, when three papers were read together with reports of committees. Between these two general sessions, the week was

filled with the meetings of sections, fifteen permanent, and thirteen special, sections. Each section held a number of meetings, in all, more than a hundred in six days. It was overpowering; worse than a three-ring circus! Of course, nobody was expected to attend all the sessions, nine, sometimes ten a day. It frequently happened that one was desirous of hearing two papers which were read at simultaneous meetings in widely separated rooms, and it was difficult to make the combination. The difficulty was increased by the fact that the sections did not begin on time—the afternoon sessions were generally half an hour late. The frequent absence of those who were billed to appear or the undue length of papers and discussions wrecked the program and made time calculations impossible. The situation was infinitely worse than at Oslo, where a few more than half as many papers were read.

After attending two congresses, I have the feeling that something is fundamentally wrong with the organization. The congress certainly reflects faithfully the present state of historical research; it has become atomized. *Atomized at a time when humanity is perishing for a vision of history as a whole, which the historian alone can give.* The historian is not simply a specialist; in truth, he is not a good specialist, if he is nothing but that. Why should not all of the afternoon sessions be general, in which subjects dealing with large periods or lines of development running through the whole history of civilization are presented and discussed? Why should subjects like historical method, or historical synthesis, be relegated to a section? It would not have been difficult to form programs for such general meetings by selecting papers from various sections, or by making the program of a section the program for a general assembly. The section meeting on the *Histoire des religions* (August 21), the one on *Histoire des lettres* (August 21), another on the Jews (August 24), and one on the *Histoire des idées et de philosophie* would have supplied valuable material for general sessions. There were thirteen more sections at Warsaw than at Oslo, thirteen special sessions. An examination of the titles of these sections shows that they might all have been placed under the old headings. The objection to that, I suppose, would be that it would be necessary to have two sessions of the same section meeting at the same time, but that would be no more objectionable than adding special sections to take care of the multitude of papers. But why should every paper be read? Why would not the printing of a summary of four pages be sufficient, or, if the paper is especially valuable, the whole paper? Or why might not each country print the papers of their representatives as the Poles did? They issued

two volumes, containing all the Polish papers read, and these volumes were distributed among the members of the congress.

It would not be difficult to simplify and clarify the program. Why not begin by the elimination of the sections for Ancient, Medieval, and Modern history? These divisions have certainly served their time and deserve to be retired. If it is desirable to deal with large, complex groups, as distinguished from logical groups such as *History of Letters, History of Religions, History of Law,* etc., why not make use of the term *culture* or *civilization,* and deal with *Greek Civilization, Byzantine Civilization,* etc.? Or the *History of France, Italy, Germany,* or *Spain?* These terms are concrete, complex, and have a definite time limit. The congress certainly should react against this atomizing tendency that deprives the members of the greatest benefits that should be derived from such meetings, namely, increase in breadth of view, in the grasp of the history of civilization as a whole, and in the evaluation of man's past life in society as history. If the number of the special sections were reduced the members of the congress might meet oftener and really become acquainted.

The language question in the congress is quite as serious as the number of sections and papers and a more difficult problem to solve. At Oslo, an English-speaking person could get on, if he could understand and speak both French and German, as there were few papers in Italian. At Warsaw, the Italians were represented seventy-five times on the programs—second only to the Poles and the French—and in some sessions the most of the papers were in Italian and the discussions largely in the same language. It is clear that in future congresses—if held in the vicinity of Italy—one will be obliged to add Italian to his language outfit. French led at Warsaw, not only on account of the number of French scholars present, but because French was the leading second language, with German next in line. English was used as a second language by only a few apart from the scholars from India, for there were not many in the audiences who could understand spoken English and when an Englishman or an American came at the end of a program, his audience, apart from a few of his fellow countrymen, would generally desert him. Some odd things happened in this Babel of tongues. It was not an uncommon thing for the reader of a paper to be unable to answer a critic, because the criticism had been made in a tongue the reader did not understand when it was spoken. Those were good old days when all scholars both spoke and understood Latin!

On account of the location of the congress, the history of Eastern Europe, and especially of Poland, was emphasized. All the Polish

papers, as already remarked, were printed in two handsome volumes of some eight hundred pages. In addition, the Poles distributed two volumes on the archives and libraries in Warsaw, and a very interesting monograph on Polish historiography. The Polish papers dealt almost exclusively with Polish subjects, with Polish institutions, and the relation of Poland at different periods with Central and Eastern Europe. There were some excellent papers on problems of the Near East and of Greece and Rome, but little on Western Europe, England, or America. Papers by Roumanians, Russians, Hungarians, and Turks, added to this emphasis on Eastern history, and even some of the papers by scholars from Western Europe made their contributions to the same subject. Quite a grist of papers on India were presented by Indian scholars. It was clearly an Oriental congress, at least a congress of the Near East of Europe and the Mediterranean. And the papers were surprisingly good, an excellent illustration of how widespread—world-wide—the knowledge of historical method is and how general is the ability to apply this method effectively in research. An examination of the Polish papers leaves one with a profound respect for Polish scholarship. They range over the whole field of history from Die schnurkeramischen Kulturen und das indoeuropäische Problem, by Sulimirski Tadeusz, from the paper by Dr. Amelja Hertz on Les débuts de la géométrie et les dernières fouilles en Mésopotamie, through papers on Les origines du tribunat de la plèbe, by Dr. Zmigryder-Konopka, who showed that the last word had not been said on the subject, on Les méthodes de la statistique des populations anciennes, in which M. Wałek-Czernecki demolished the method of Beloch, but declined to accept the pessimistic attitude of Cicotti and suggested improved methods; to the paper by M. Handelsman, on Le Prince Czartoryski et la Roumanie, 1834–1850, and the one by M. Wisława, on La politique de Metternich avant l'annexion de la République de Cracovie, both based on a large amount of new material from unpublished sources.

The rôle of the Russians at the congress was interesting, a fine illustration of Freeman's saying about history and politics. A special section was created, at their suggestion, dealing with *Histoire des mouvements sociaux,* to which two sessions were devoted, the Russians, with one exception reading all the papers. What are "social movements"? Is not all history concerned with social movements? From the papers, it is evident that the title means *socialist* movements. They participated actively in the discussion of the papers dealing with historical synthesis, developing at some length their theory of the material philosophy of history.

The section on the teaching of history held four interesting sessions, the burden of the day being carried largely by the Poles, who are very much interested in the subject and have some very good ideas. Through M. Lhéritier, secretary both of the International Conference for the Teaching of History and of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, the work of this section is kept in touch with the work of the International Conference. Very important work is being accomplished by this latter body.

FRED MORROW FLING.

The University of Nebraska.

THE ROMANTICS AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

I.

EVERYBODY who is at all interested in the life of Washington knows that of late years certain romantic biographers have made a sentimental discovery. They phrase it by saying that they have proved him to be a "human being". What they mean is that they believe he was in love with his neighbor's wife; that Martha was his means of stifling an attachment that was real; that after becoming engaged to Martha he was capable of writing to the other woman a passionate declaration of undying devotion. The other woman was Sally Fairfax—that is, Mrs. George William Fairfax, whose husband was perhaps his best friend.

But how do the Romantics make their point? By marvelous modes of their own. Let us try their method by a test case. But first a word upon their cardinal evidence, the keystone of their arch. It is nothing more momentous than a newspaper article. At least, that is how your hard-headed historian who is not inclined toward romantic evidence would describe their argument. In the New York *Herald,* March 30, 1877, there was an article on a collection of letters to be sold by famous old Bangs and Company, at auction, the following day. The text of one of these letters was printed. It was addressed to Mrs. Fairfax and signed "George Washington"; the date was September 12, 1758.[1] Apparently this letter was sold with the rest of the collection, but to whom it was sold is not publicly known. And that is the whole story of this famous letter. If it still exists, its owner is keeping it carefully hidden. No writer on Washington has ever seen it—or, at least, will not say that he

[1] Reprinted by John C. Fitzpatrick in *The Writings of George Washington* (Bicentennial Edition, Washington, 1931–1933), II. 287; also by Worthington Chauncey Ford, *Writings of George Washington* (New York, 1889–1893), II. 95.

has. None of them has subjected it to the tests which any careful student insists on having made by experts in the matter of a doubtful manuscript—tests of paper, ink, handwriting. Up to date, so far as historians are aware, the Sally Fairfax myth has for its foundation a newspaper article and nothing else. To be sure we hear cryptic intimations about letters "in possession of the family"—what family?—that would prove everything. But the controversy has gone on for a number of years and these mysterious letters continue to be kept secret. We are not even informed just who are meant by "the family". Scattered letters to Mrs. Fairfax known to have been written by Washington can be juggled any way you want—if you are a Romantic, that is—but without the crucial missing letter they prove nothing. The Romantics are zealously holding in air an arch without a keystone.

The way they do it—this is is the truly interesting part of the story. To illustrate: take so talented a biographer as Mr. Rupert Hughes and try out the argument in a single episode. Washington resigned from the Virginian forces, because of sharp disagreements with Governor Dinwiddie in the autumn of 1754. He returned to service in the spring of 1755, an aid to General Braddock. What happened between while? According to Mr. Hughes, who has accepted the romantic interpretation, he was desperately unhappy, in love with Mrs. Fairfax, and with nothing to do but mope at Mount Vernon.[2] Mr. Hughes paints a vivid picture not only of a gloomy winter at Mt. Vernon, but of a brilliant spring at Alexandria, the arrival of an imposing British army and Sally Fairfax "competing with other married ladies for the attention of the notorious rake, General Braddock, who held a very gay court in Alexandria".[3] He assures us that "while all this springtime fervor [of martial preparation] was in the air with its promise of glorious summer, George Washington had nothing better to do than to tag after Sally Fairfax, watch the fine straight lines of the British regulars swing past, and hear other voices than his own sing out commands and set the bugles to chanting". Finally, as the climax of this picturesque writing, "His yearning [for military service] must have been brought to the notice of General Braddock. Perhaps Sally Fairfax murmured to him that the finest young officer in Virginia was wasting himself in idleness".[4] Boiled down into plain English, these glowing passages imply that Sally flirted the General into giving Washington a new chance.

[2] Rupert Hughes, *Washington* (New York, 1926–1930), I. 198.
[3] *Ibid.*, 193.
[4] *Ibid.*, 198.

But what does the story rest upon? On two assumptions, and two misapprehensions.

The first assumption is that Washington had nothing to attract his soul (unless it was Sally) in the winter of 1754–1755; that the winter was one long moping. Mr. Hughes has forgotten to examine his relations to his estate. It is habitual to speak of Washington as having inherited Mt. Vernon from his brother, Lawrence, who died in the summer of 1752. This is slightly inaccurate. Lawrence bequeathed him a reversionary interest that was to become effective in the event of the death of Lawrence's little daughter, but the widow, Anne Washington, was to have possession during her life. The speedy death of the child and the second marriage of Anne, followed by her removal to the estate of her new husband, led to negotiations with her brother-in-law. They dragged along nearly two years. During all that time Washington was not the proprietor of Mt. Vernon, did not even reside there. He appears hardly to have seen it during 1753; during 1754—until he resigned toward the close of the year—he was mainly on duty in the Indian country.[5] But all that while his thoughts must have recurred frequently to Mt. Vernon. He loved the place with an almost extravagant devotion. Apparently, these years, it was more or less neglected—Anne, it would seem, being quite absorbed in her new home. That he visited it now and then—almost certainly for conferences with his brother's executors—is known. Exactly what place he thought of as his own home, these years of the neglect of Mt. Vernon, we cannot say. Perhaps it was his mother's house at Fredericksburg. But one thing is plain, and it is a great fact in his emotional life. During the latter part of 1754 the negotiations with Anne reached a satisfactory conclusion. She did not want Mt. Vernon; he, with his whole heart, did. In December, 1754, she sold him her life interest. A wonderful day, when he rode through the gateway to Mt. Vernon and dismounted at his own doorstep the Master of the estate.

II.

There can hardly have been a more significant moment in his inner life. He was not yet twenty-two. Never did a youth have fairer prospects opening before him: he had powerful friends, his family was intrenched in the center of political influence; though he had resigned his commission, he was still one of the adjutants general of the colony; and now, he was a great landed proprietor, the estate was his—the fields and woods and gardens for which he had such a deep and abiding affection.

[5] A knowledge of his movements, these years, rests on his correspondence with Governor Dinwiddie, a few private letters, and his Ledger A containing his personal accounts.

Thus opened the winter which the Romantics would have us imagine as a valley of humiliation. On the contrary the only definite evidence surviving seems to indicate a gay winter. His joy in the possession of the estate would in itself incline us to expect a high mood—the assumptions of the Romantics remaining still assumptions only. A pleasant changeful life, this winter, is shadowed where the Romantics would be least likely to look for it, in his account books. He scrupulously noted his petty cash. Now he wins or loses a small sum at cards. The place is mentioned often enough to let us see that it was a winter of coming and going in many parts of the colony. No evidence that he was chained unhappily to Mt. Vernon and to the mournful contemplation of the unobtainable Sally. Other recreations figure in these accounts, especially billiards.[6] His account books tell other things besides the nature and places of his recreation. Little glimpses there are which show that he was taking thought for the refurnishing of his estate. In the first week of January he was at Fredericksburg. On a day early in the month, he mounted and rode off to the south, to Todd's Ordinary. He spent the night at Todd's and the next day rode to Colonel Baylor's plantation. One lucky servant at the Colonel's got a tip of a shilling from Washington this day. When the visitor rode back to Fredericksburg he had purchased three slaves—bought at a sale near Baylor's.[7]

Let us grant that all this is negative evidence, so far as it concerns the drama of the forlorn youth and a moping winter. But there is no evidence on the other side except the newspaper article more than a hundred years after.

And what about the second assumption—that Sally did some tall flirting with Braddock before Washington got his new chance—this is strangely interwoven with misapprehensions of fact. The basis of the drama crumbles into nothing when closely examined in the cold light of historic chronology. That is to say—Braddock landed on February 20, 1755. He went at once to Williamsburg and remained there until the early days of March. The official letter inviting Washington to resume the military life as Braddock's personal aid was written at Williamsburg by his secretary, Captain Orme, March the second.[8] Therefore, ten days form the outside limit in which all the events of the romantic drama could have taken place—the moping jealousy of the young man in voluntary retirement watching a brilliant pageant at Alexandria; Sally ogling

[6] Ledger A, Jan. 13, Feb. 26, 1755.
[7] Ledger A, Jan. 9, 1755.
[8] Fitzpatrick, *Writings* I. 110; Ford, I. 142.

the dissolute General, and their swift establishment of a confidential relation; her whispers in his ear that one way to make her happy would be to find an appointment which would soothe the pride of her sullen devotee; the instantaneous yielding of the General; Washington's second chance at the military life.

III.

Indeed, a drama made to a playwright's hand. But what has history to say about each of its cardinal features?

To begin with, the pageant at Alexandria watched by Washington with envious eyes *before* he received his appointment? There wasn't any. Braddock, when he landed, February 20, did not have with him his whole fleet. In the words of the classic history of the British army, it was "past the middle of March before the whole of the transports arrived in Hampton Roads. . . . The transports were ordered to ascend the Potomac to Alexandria, where a camp was to be formed".[9] Of course some of the early arrivals probably went up the river immediately and may have been discharging their men and cargoes during the last few days of February. They were but a portion of the army. The General was not with them. Their time was occupied, that last week of February, not in holding brilliant reviews—with no commander to review them—but in the noisy routine of disembarkation, unloading stores, forming a camp. The brilliant reviews in time came off, but they were six weeks later, a month after Washington had joyfully accepted his new appointment.

Chronology is not the only enemy of this glittering tale. Geography has a word to say. Most of those ten days preceding the letter of Orme to Washington, Braddock was at Williamsburg. Apparently Mr. Hughes implies that Sally did her ogling at Alexandria. If done at all, it must have been done inside those ten days—in fact, within a period still shorter. A letter of Dinwiddie's makes the sojourn of Braddock at Williamsburg date from Sunday, February 23.[10] This cuts down the period during which Sally might have played her part to an even week. The only place where she could play it was a hundred and sixty miles from her house at Belvoir on the Potomac. Did she rush down to Williamsburg the moment Braddock arrived, or was she there before him—a siren of the Western World lying artfully in wait for this weather-beaten Ulysses—and was her campaign of conquest, under Venus' ban-

[9] J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army* (London, 1899–1930), II. 269.
[10] Francis Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe* (Boston, 1884), I. 187.

ner, as fast and intrepid as some of his own on the Field of Mars? In the lingo of to-day—what do you make of that?

Of course, Mr. Hughes would not for a moment cast any reflections upon the glorious Sally. He regards the episode—as he imagines it—as one of the great love stories of all time. All he would have us understand is that Sally was a great lady in a world where feminine manipulation of the mere male meant no more than leading the right card in whist. As to Braddock, was he not a gay dog who loved the ladies, of whom very naughty stories were told in London? We are agreed that Mrs. Fairfax was a charming young person with beautiful eyes and an ironical mouth—her portrait being the evidence—so sure of herself that she could flirt with the Evil One and with no depressing results—except perhaps to His Satanic Majesty.

This curious matter of how Washington got on Braddock's staff has troubled his biographers from the beginning. Marshall, in his first edition, though he had five volumes at his disposal, is silent on the subject. Forty years afterward, in his second and abridged edition he cautiously referred to it, following an account which meanwhile had been made current by Sparks. This account was put into one noble—but partially erroneous—page in the only life of Washington that has stirred men's imaginations—Irving's—and is to be found in more or less distortion in a number of later lives. Lossing accepted about the same story that Sparks and others accept:[11] namely, that Braddock had heard of Washington's powers and attainments and therefore offered him an appointment. Of course none of these had anying to say about Mrs. Fairfax. All of them are floundering in a chronological mess from which they fail to extricate themselves.

Far more adroit than any of these versions is an attempt to solve the problem by a modern writer who alone may be classed with Irving among Washington biographers. Dr. Weir Mitchell in his charming little volume *The Youth of Washington* has an explanation of the incident which at first glance appears to be perfect. Washington "chanced to be" at Williamsburg when Braddock arrived. Sir John Sinclair was also in Williamsburg. Washington adroitly prevented a quarrel between Sinclair and Colonel Byrd. Sir John invited him to dine with General Braddock. The rest was what a loyal biographer should hope for. The

[11] John Marshall, *Life of George Washington* (Philadelphia, 1833–1835), II. 7; Jared Sparks, *Writings of George Washington* (Boston, 1834–1837), II. 69, note; Washington Irving, *Life of George Washington* (New York, 1855–1859), I. 157; Benson J. Lossing, *Washington and the American Republic* (New York, 1879), I. 138–139.

next day Washington rode homeward, stopped to see his mother, and at her house was overtaken by a messenger with Orme's letter inviting him to join Braddock's military household.[12]

Another pleasant tale; quite as dramatic as any other and agreeably free from sentimental tragedy. But again chronology insists on making a mess of it. The keen eye of Mr. John C. Fitzpatrick was the first to bring Washington's private accounts to bear on this problem. His Ledger A shows that he was at Belvoir February 21—the day after Braddock landed—when he lost 8/9 to a Mr. Spearing at billiards. Hence Dr. Mitchell's first point is erroneous. Pure fiction is the statement that Washington chanced to be at Williamsburg when Braddock arrived. Two days later Washington paid a bill at Moxley's Ordinary, Cameron, Fairfax County—a good long way from Williamsburg. This was on a Sunday, the same Sunday which Dinwiddie mentions as the date of Braddock's arrival at the capital. On the Wednesday following, Washington was at Belvoir again, and once more lost a few shillings—this time "at cards".[13] If Washington was at Williamsburg any moment when Braddock was there it must have been subsequent to the evening of February 28—allowing for two days hard riding from Belvoir. It is just conceivable therefore that he may have been presented to the General that night, or the next day, that he rode off—why we are left to guess!—after being in the capital at most only thirty-six hours, from evenfall, February 28, to morning, March 2; and that the moment he left, Braddock ordered Orme to write the letter which pursued him to Mt. Vernon. Remembering that we are concerned with a very positive General who might just as well have made his offer by word of mouth the night before, the postponement of that offer until after Washington had ridden away is curious. The Williamsburg part of this chronology is purely guesswork. Mr. Fitzpatrick, pondering the implications of the account books has concluded "that Washington seems to have been at Mount Vernon on March 3".[14]

Dr. Mitchell's book is one of those delectable fancies in which the line between fact and fiction is allowed to hover daintily and to justify its caprice on the plea that by taking liberty with fact it sets free the soul of an event. There are manufactured conversations very cleverly put together from various sources—authentic bits they are, mortised into a pattern that is imaginary.

12 Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, I. 107; Ford, I. 141.

13 Ledger A, Feb. 23, 26, 1755.

14 John C. Fitzpatrick, *George Washington, Colonial Traveller* (Indianapolis, 1927), p. 68.

IV.

These desperate attempts to make a drama out of Washington's appointment miss the heart of the matter. A far more plausible conjecture than any of these might have come to any of the romantic biographers if he had not ignored the testy but honest and manly old Governor of Virginia. He, no less than the young man with whom he had quarreled, had his moods and could lose his temper. Also—resembling again his young protégé—he could recover his temper, send his mood about face, and do a man's part confessing and retrieving an injustice. Is not the common sense of the matter the conclusion that it was Dinwiddie's regret because they had quarreled—not the handsome eyes of a reckless woman, nor the impetuousness of a hot-tempered gentleman over his wine—that made amends by urging upon Braddock a full recognition of the merits of Colonel Washington?

Oddly enough there is early evidence that some such tradition was ignored by Marshall in his huge first book, and that Sparks rather doubtfully—his knowledge of Dinwiddie being slight—got up courage to accept it, at least, in part. The first biographer of Washington—famous old "Parson" Weems, inventor of the hatchet and the cherry tree and other myths long recognized as such—is invariably denounced by all the moderns who have set out to revolutionize the traditional image which Weems created. And yet, they have an amusing way of discovering that whenever his subject matter appeals to them he must, this once, have been correct. For example, Weems has a remark which Dinwiddie is said to have made when he engaged Washington to go to Fort Le Boeuf, and this remark more than one later biographer has transferred to his own page without a historical qualm. "Now Christ save my saoul, but ye'er a braw lad!" [15] And as to his appointment by Braddock, Weems knows all about it. When Braddock met the Governor, he promptly exclaimed, "Where is Colonel Washington? I long to see him." A delightful fictitious conversation ends in Braddock's indignant condemnation of the policy that had driven so notable a person into retirement. The Governor had given him a full account of Washington's troubles.

Here, at last, we have the fountain head of something in the way of tradition that is worth while. Mrs. Fairfax and the sullen young gentleman watching reviews that did not happen, and the quarrel of Sir John

[15] The many editions of Weems render pagination futile. This quotation is in the latter part of chapter V. Dinwiddie talks with Braddock, in the true Weems style, in chapter VI.

Sinclair and Colonel Byrd, may go to their places among the shadows that romancers know how to conjure up and to clothe with apparent life. But Weems also has to be corrected. The initiative must be taken away from Braddock. By implication Weems himself has done this. So Sparks perceived when he decided that in substance Weems was probably historical, and expressed his conclusion in a very general and noncommittal way, in the statement which Marshall, in his second edition, and Irving cautiously followed: "General Braddock, knowing his value, and the importance of securing his services to the expedition, directed Mr. Orme, his aid-de-camp" to ask him to serve.[16]

Had Sparks been a little more analytic, had Dinwiddie made more of an appeal to his imagination, he would have done what he came so near to doing and put his finger on the true explanation. Thereby he would have taken the first step toward elevating this impetuous old Scotchman to the place he deserves, which is just beginning to be accorded to him, both as a man and as an official.

Surely, it was Dinwiddie who—not in bright-eyed whispering but in his hard, just, Scotch way—put it up to Braddock to do the sensible thing and add to his staff the Virginian whom he most needed to have.

And so, Washington became a member of the military household of General Braddock. There is but one more confusion to be cleared away in the fictitious drama of How Sally Fairfax Didn't get his Second Chance for Him. The great days at Alexandria, the days when he watched "the fine straight lines of the British regulars swing past", have been dated a month too early. They occurred after he had received his appointment, after he had made up his quarrel with Dinwiddie—which took place subsequent to the day when the Governor and the General drove into Alexandria in the Governor's coach and six, dashing cavalrymen before and behind. There followed the Alexandrian episode, recklessly gay. And now the Romantics shall have their wish. The General and Sally Fairfax came together. But in what a different fashion from that which the Romantics have imagined. That Washington was a part of the scene cannot be doubted—not, however as an unhappy onlooker whose fortunes Sally was trying to mend, but as a blithe participant at the heart of the event, the General's confident protégé. For this part of the story we must accept Mr. Hughes's conclusions.[17] Braddock's flirtations take on a divertingly prosaic aspect which is the last touch undermining the ardent rôle attributed to him by Sally's romantic historians.

[16] Sparks, *Writings*, II. 69, note.

[17] Hughes, *Washington*, I. 205.

His favor veered from one lady to another in a way that may not have seemed explicable at the time, but for which later Mr. Washington found an explanation. In a laughing letter he wrote it out for the benefit of Mrs. Fairfax. "I have at last with great pains and difficulty discovered the reason why Mrs. Wardrope is a greater favorite of Genl. Braddock than Mrs. F——x, and met with more respect at the review in Alexandria. The cause I shall communicate, after having rallied you upon neglecting the means which produced the effect. And what do you think they were? why, nothing less, I assure you, than a present of delicious cake and potted wood-cocks! which so affected the palate as to leave a deep impression upon the hearts of *all* who tasted of them. How, then, could the General do otherwise than admire, not only the *charms,* but the politeness, of this lady!"

NATHANIEL WRIGHT STEPHENSON.

Scripps College.

DOCUMENTS

Federal Generals and a Good Press

In the *American Historical Review* for January, 1918,[1] appeared an article by Professor James G. Randall on The Newspaper Problem in its Bearing upon Military Secrecy during the Civil War. That was the year in which the American Expeditionary Force was to take its share in the terrible struggle on the fields of Flanders and of France. In publishing such an article the managing editor and the author, drawing attention to the errors tolerated in another great contest, desired to uphold the officials of the government in a policy of rigorous control of military information. Readers of Dr. Randall's article were doubtless astonished at the feebleness of the official arm, especially in the North, during the Civil War, and indignant that the problem of military success was made doubly difficult through a false notion of the right of the people "back home" to know precisely what was going on and through the natural desire of newspaper owners and editors to enhance the prestige of their journals, a desire quickened by a modest hope of increasing their revenues. As Professor Randall points out, in specific instances unnecessary battles were fought and men killed because of the premature disclosure of the movements of troops. This was not always the fault of the journalists alone, for ambitious generals were anxious to see their feats, actual or alleged, duly celebrated, in order that their chances of preferment over rivals might be improved. The situation had another even less pleasing aspect. Officers of the government at Washington or in the field, anxious to guard themselves and their departments against newspaper attack, were ready to purchase immunity by intrusting important secrets to influential journalists. The following selections from the confidential correspondence of James Gordon Bennett, of the New York *Herald,* preserved in the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, illustrate especially the two purposes just mentioned.

I. S. P. Hanscom to James Gordon Bennett

Herald
Head-Quarters, Army of the Potomac,
Washington, Oc. 6 1861.

Dear Sir;

I had a long talk with Sanford,[2] President Am. Tel. Company, last night

[1] XXIII. 303–323.

[2] E. S. Sanford.

about the annoyances of the past week. They have been numerous and in most cases the assumption of power by the censor has been carried to an extent unwarranted either by War Department or a decent regard for private rights. Scott,[3] Assistant Secretary of War, assured me last night that there should be no more of it; that the Censor has never been authorized to stop private despatches, explaining what had already been sent. Your question why I had not replied to questions about Fremont first developed to me the fact that my despatches had been stopped. Sanford, as well as Scott assures me that we will have no more such trouble.

. . .

Yours Truly

S. P. Hanscom.[4]

II. Malcolm Ives to James Gordon Bennett

Confidential Washington January 15th 1861. [1862]

My dear Sir.

The new Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton,[5] in accordance with the promise he had made me on the day of his nomination, last evening sent me word that he arranged an interview for me with General McClellan for last evening. As I entered the room, he introduced me with the remark:— "Now General, we will show Dr. Ives (you see the Pope's titles come in play here!)[6] what we think of the course of the Herald." The new Secretary then gave me all the information he possessed about the recent changes: namely that he was totally unaware of his being seriously thought of as a candidate for the Secretaryship until I told him, just one hour before he was sent for by the President; that he feared difficulties might arise with respect to his confirmation by the Senate; that when confirmed he should retain Assistant Secretary Scott, if the latter desires to remain; that the policy of the War Department would fully accord with that of the Commander in Chief[7] and the President; that other Cabinet changes were in contemplation, though he thought *not* Mr Chase, who sustains McClellan, and not certainly Welles, who has been more foolish than dishonest, unless he should himself wish to go, in which case Holt, he *presumed,* but was not certain, would take his place, but more probably Smith who wishes to be on the bench, and for whose place Schuyler Colfax is being pushed. Nothing however more than this had transpired last night. The story of Cameron's having vainly sought an interview with McClellan *five* times, and also that his object was to present peremptory demands, were contradicted. Cameron had been refused *once,* because McClellan was too ill to see him; but the refusal was maliciously exaggerated by the latter's enemies, and *foolishly* propagated by enemies of the former, who are on McClellan's staff, and who desired to depreciate the adversary of their chief.—

[3] Thomas Alexander Scott, familiarly known as Tom Scott, appointed on August 1, 1861, resigned on June 1, 1862, to resume his duties as an officer of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

[4] At the time chief correspondent of the *Herald* in Washington.

[5] Edwin M. Stanton was nominated to take the place of Simon Cameron, who was dismissed on January 11, 1862. Stanton was confirmed on January 15.

[6] It was reported that Ives had been a priest and that he had been unfrocked.

[7] McClellan was commander in chief from November 1, 1861 to March 11, 1862, when his duties were restricted to the Army of the Potomac.

The stories in the Times concerning the change of Cabinet were manufactured, beyond the shadow of a doubt, in New York. The correspondents of that paper are not tolerated any where, and McClellan and Stanton spoke of it and them with absolute disgust.— Stanton then asked me to call on him at his house this afternoon, and left.—

I may here put in, parenthetically, that it was Stanton who communicated to me Buchanan's views as expressed in recent letters, and who gave me the history of a transaction during the last days of B.'s administration. He told me all confidentially, but on the morning when I told him of his appointment, I went to his office for the express purpose of being relieved from the obligation of secrecy, and of being permitted to tell you what it is important you should know. He finally, *after* the discourse about Cabinet matters, said: "Tell Mr Bennett every thing, orally, in New York, but do not write it", and then added what I told you before that if he *did* receive the appointment, he would show that he was no middle measures man, but should throw overboard the rest of the press and cling to the Herald alone.

After Stanton left McClellan's little study, the latter locked the door, and kept me with him for three hours, closeted alone. With much feeling, and a manner so heartfelt, so evidently pure and sincere as to be absolutely touching, he began by saying that, on the previous day (Monday) he had been sent for to meet the President and a majority of the members of his Cabinet; that they had demanded, peremptorily, information concerning the manner in which he intended to carry on the campaign and that he had courteously but firmly refused to open his lips upon the subject. "What I declined communicating to them", he said, "I am now going to convey through you to Mr Bennett and *Mr Hudson*[8]; I am going to give you *all* the knowledge I possess myself, with no reserve, and if you choose to take a pen you may make notes of what I am going to say, and I will willingly give you all the time you require to make the information complete." He said that *one member of his staff alone* was possessed of his plans, and no other individual living. He told me all that had ever passed between himself and Mr Hanscom, and while highly praising the energy in seeking for news of your Washington Correspondent, acquainted me why he would prefer *not* giving him *anticipatory* information of importance, and why he did not wish either Mr Hanscom *or any one else,* to know that you had his confidence to the extent you have.— After informing me that Mr Hudson's name was a household word with some of his nearest friends, and that they cherished for him an admiration which he himself had learned to share, he surprized me by establishing a claim of my own upon his confidence, through some family friends, and added:— But I particularly wish to charge you with a message to Mr Bennett:— "Mr Bennett has stood by me in the hour of the bitterest anxiety of my whole life— a sadder one than I can anticipate for the future. He has done so disinterestedly, nobly and with the whole force of his paper. He and he alone, has upheld me, cheered me and encouraged me, when every other newspaper heaped upon me calumny and abuse, at the very time that I was saving them from the horror of an invasion, which it is incomprehensible to me at this moment to explain our delivery from. I shall *never, never, never* forget his kindness, and I want him to know that I cherish him

[8] Frederic Hudson (1819–1875) was the managing editor of the *Herald*. He had entered its service at an early age. He retired in 1866. He was author of *Journalism in the United States, from 1690 to 1872* (New York, 1873).

in my heart, and that I shall strive with all the energy my Maker has given me to prove, as I have no doubt I shall, that his confidence has not been misplaced." He then rather apologized for saying that it was his duty to require a solemn pledge from me, not only that what he was about to tell me should be revealed to no living being, excepting yourself and Mr Hudson, *exclusive of every one else;* but also that we would not ever let the fact of the possession of such knowledge be known.— I gave him the pledge he required, and he then communicated the following important details, which I give almost in his own words.—

1. The Union sentiment in North Carolina, Tennessee, North Georgia, and several counties in South Carolina, has been steadily increasing, together with great dissatisfaction with the rebel government for some time past; the period of service of 80,000 Confederate troops is about to expire in a few weeks, and it may be assumed safely that not over 10,000 of them will reenlist; General Buell's army in Kentucky was, when he took command there, in the most deplorable state, and that of General Halleck was quite as bad. It is evident, from these and other motives, connected with affairs on the sea coast and in Virginia, that the lapse of every hour of time was an increase of moral and physical power to the North, and of more than proportionate weakness to the South. Much suffering, possible disaster, and great carnage would have been saved, if the federal armies could have continued to increase in efficiency, preparation and discipline until about April, when the war might have been ended at a blow.— Still higher political considerations have caused the Commander in Chief to conclude, reluctantly, that an *immediate* victory or series of victories has become indispensable. Financial necessities; shattered national confidence; the precarious state of our foreign relations, *which Mr Seward, the President and the Comman.' in Chief are united in believing can only be restored to a safe and healthy condition by success;* heaps upon heaps of misrepresentations of abolitionists, which are gradually creating disaffection, and sowing the seeds for future embarrassments in the West, all indicate that our armies must act AT ONCE, "more brilliantly perhaps but less humanely" than had been at first intended.—

2. The reported movements of gunboats on the Mississipi river, and any movements that will be reported within a short space of time, will be mere feints, and will lead to no other result than to obfuscate the enemy.

3. General Buell's forces in Kentucky will begin to act *now*—within a week. The General in Chief will give me the day when a part of it will move tonight. It is to be divided into two corps, and the first, the movements of which follow, will advance from Somerset, under command of G.[1] George Thomas (unless Buell should have changed his mind, and determined to assume it himself, since his last letter) composed of 25,000 men. It will take the old Ridge road, which is an excellent winter road, pass through Walkers Gap (Tennessee) on to Jacksboro and Knoxville. It will take 10,000 arms with abundant clothing and stores for Eastern Tennessee Union men, rouse that section, and take possession of the East Tennessee Railroad, *cutting off communication between the Mississipi river and the Atlantic.* Reliable information has been received that the onward progress of this corps will be the signal for a Union uprising in N. Georgia, North South Carolina and Eastern Tennessee.

4. The second corps of Buells army which is composed of at least 70 or 80,000 good troops will *perhaps* be able to go forward in three weeks, cer-

tainly within a month. It will advance on the line of Railroad, through Mumfordsville and Bowling Green to Nashville, supported by a powerful flotilla of gunboats, which will go up the Cumberland river. Gunboats, as a diversion, will go up the Tennessee river also, but this will be a feint. In order to prevent General Pillow from assisting General Buckner, a portion of this force will menace Columbus, either taking that city or so attacking as to keep Pillow occupied.— Halleck, who is to co-operate with Buell, has had immense difficulties to contend against; but his last letter states that they are nearly overcome; that North Missouri will be quiet within two weeks, and that he will then have only Price to contend against, which he regards as but a small consideration. He as well as Buell have been embarassed by the misrepresentations of radicals, who have led the people to believe that the President, by advice of Commander in Chief, had determined to retard operations in the West, while, in reality, they have both been hastening preparations to the utmost extent of their power.

5. It had been the purpose of General McClellan that the movements of Burnside's expedition and of the army which will march through Walkers Gap to Knoxville, should be as nearly as possible simultaneous. Slight delays will somewhat impair this arrangement—they will virtually act in concert. The first point of attack of General Burnside will be, after passing through Hatteras inlet, Roanoke island, which he will carry, fortify and hold; controlling Currituck sound; occupying the mouths of the canals; cutting off provisions from Norfolk, and acting in Albemarle sound, according to circumstances. When this is done, he will go to Newbern, where there is only an open sandbag fort, and send one detachment to occupy Beaufort (N. C.) and besiege and carry Fort Macon, which will give a harbor of 17 feet water. At the same time, a sufficient force will advance into the interior on Goldsboro, the point of junction of the Wilmington & Weldon & Green, Gaston and Raleigh Railroads. These railroads are built, through a large section, upon piles, and may be destroyed with the utmost ease. This will be done. General McClellan calculates upon there being a strong Union sentiment in the interior of North Carolina, and is sanguine of our troops being able to march upon Raleigh, and holding it with safety. He is prepared to send any amount of reinforcements, and will do so as they become needful to accomplish his designs. In any case; *what is certain* is that while Buell cuts off communication between the Miss. river and the Atlantic, Burnside will interrupt it between Virginia and the South, and even if Raleigh is not occupied at once, the whole strategical objects he has in view will be obtained.

6. The success of Buell and Burnside will compel the Confederate army in Virginia to fight for their lives. General McClellan's mind need not be made up now where he will fight; but he will be able to do so just where he pleases, on his own ground. He will beat the rebels, and the rebellion will be ended, or, at least, its strength will be irrecoverably broken. The probabilities are that the Waterloo of the war will be some where on the Lynchburg and Winchester road to Richmond, and success is inevitable. The general Union sentiment throughout the South will then be shattered; reaction will develop spontaneously, and the palladium of Southern hopes being destroyed, the restoration of peace must speedily follow.— The entire Confederate strength in all Western Virginia is estimated by General McClellan, at 150,000 men, and they could bring from 100 to 125,000 into the field of battle, in a general action.— The federal troops including all in Baltimore, Romney, etc., etc., counting sick and incapables, about the District of Colum-

bia, is about 200,000 men—say 190,000 fit for duty. If McClellan were to advance "straight forward", with all that could be made available at a short notice, he would have 130,000 troops as an *outside* number. If he advances on any other line he could not muster over 110,000. He says, however, that when the latter have once been under fire, they will be inferior to no forces in the world; while his own private information tallies with that published from the Richmond Examiner, in the Herald of about the 10 of January, that the Confederate soldiers will not drill, and that their morale is bad.

7. It had been originally purposed that Sherman and Dupont should proceed from Port Royal to Fernandina. This intention has been changed in consequence of the strong representations of General Sherman that he can take and hold Savannah. He has now 17,000 men, a regiment of cavalry and two batteries are on the way, and 10,000 more infantry are about leaving as reinforcements.—

8. In consequence of the firm persuasion of the Commander in Chief and of the President that England intends forcing the United States into a war if possible, the former has recently taken steps to put Key West and Tortugas in a state of defence. 5000 men, under General Brannan, are under orders to go to Key West at once. Heavy guns and ammunition, clothing and provisions *sufficient to stand a siege of two years* are already there, and both are upon a full war footing, as they have never been before.— The General is also putting the entire seaboard into a state of defence as rapidly as possible, and he "feels it to be his duty to be provided for the extremest emergency".— (See later a request to the Herald).

9. The forces at Ship island will remain quiet for the moment, but it is General McClellan's intention to attack New Orleans *himself,* as soon as the battle in Virginia shall have emancipated him from the necessity of supervising operations here in person. He thinks Louisiana will perhaps hold out, as the corner into which secession will be driven, later than other states, and he will individually lead the army till it is to destroy the latest figments of rebellion. "They must be beaten and they *shall* be beaten in Virginia, and then I will knock them to pieces at New Orleans." "Otherwise, I—I—!" and he clasped his hands together and *smiled,* but did not say, what would, in case of calamity, be his own fate.— He seems however to be as *sure* and *undoubted* of success, as a second Providence.

10. McClellan says the rebels could have taken Washington with ease up to the 10th of August. He gives a most graphic description of the difficulties that prevailed, and says that he is sure of one past event at least, and that is that he saved the capital. His language concerning the President is enthusiastic. He thinks his apparent weakness the result of a bonhomie which hurts nothing. When however I remarked that he must have suffered much under Cameron, he groaned out "Ah! Ah. Ah", but added, "It is best that he should go in peace, and that no needless strife about the past should be created". McClellan's staff are many of them so enthusiastic as to be imprudent. He talked of their using his name to push forward Key, and repudiated any desire they had attributed to him to make him Ass. Sec. of War. They are nevertheless all good, honest fellows.

Fox left here for New York a day or two since. It occured to me that you might have received a call from him, though he did not tell his own wife he was going.

I asked General Mc. C. what suggestions he should make to *you,* if he could see you. He said:— "I should ask Mr Bennett to do *just what he has*

done; to preach patience, forbearance and confidence and to try to get over the greatest evil of a Civil war among the people, namely, undue eagerness for precipitate and unwarrantable movements on the part of their agents. I shall cheerfully die in this cause; but I *know* we shall succeed. Ask Mr Bennett also to call *continually* for local companies of artillery in our sea board cities and towns. We shall want them to defend our harbor fortifications. Let such companies be organized; government should supply means of instruction; and they should be paid when on duty. If there *is* a foreign war, we shall bitterly rue want of preparation in this respect; if there is not, the measure will be an equally good one."

I could write at length still about Cabinet matters, but this despatch I have wanted to be accurate and it has wearied me. I walked from the Treasury Department to the Capitol with McClellan this morning, and he asked me to come in *every* evening at his home, and said he would always tell me all he knew. I am to go there this evening.— I am to go now, by appointment to see Chase, and afterwards to see Holt.—

With sincere respect

Yr ob^{t} ser

M. I.

III. Malcolm Ives to Frederic Hudson

Confidential Washington January 16th 1861. [1862]

My dear sir

Your telegraphic despatch has partially dispelled a fit of the blues. Wykoff,[9] however, arrived this morning, and told me that Mr. Bennett had read him a letter from me, detailing, paragraph by paragraph its contents, which I had marked "strictly private and confidential." As he is a notorious chatterbox I felt *sorry*, to say the least. I told him I should telegraph my feelings and he then owned that although he had heard the letter read, and tried *vainly* to pump you as to its authorship, he had *lied* in saying Mr B. told him I wrote it. I frightened him. I would only say that if the knowledge of any such letter as I wrote yesterday should transpire— or even of the existence of such a letter—it would be an irreparable calamity.

Both Mr Cameron and Mr Lincoln have thanked me for the telegraphic despatch in yesterday's papers and desired me to express gratitude to Mr Bennett for the very ably put editorial. Mr Stanton and General McClellan are equally satisfied.

Just after sending my first despatch this morning . . . a darkey came up and requested me to go up to the Command.^{r} in Chief's house. He wished me to know, he said, that he had received telegraphic messages, this morning, from General Halleck, saying that two regiments had started to support the *second* (Western) movement of General Buell; that two more would leave in a day or two, and that a larger force would start, with artillery, etc, within a week, and that his whole force would be ready to advance *in two weeks*.

[9] Henry Wikoff, a notorious intriguer, was called before a committee of the House of Representatives to tell how he had secured advance information for the *Herald* of an address of President Lincoln. Because he refused to answer, he was held in custody in the Capitol itself for two days. (New York *Herald*, Feb. 14, Mar. 3, 1862; *Memoirs of Henry Villard*, Boston, 1904, I. 157).

The General said this was excellent news, and would expedite every thing. He had received no despatches or letters from General Buell, but may by to-morrow morning.

Halleck is contending against *prodigious* difficulties, deserving support, and is doing his duty admirably.—

General Mc C. said that if I would come to see him tomorrow morning at 10 oc. he would give me documents, which he had ordered one of his aids to copy, including the very last letters of General Halleck and of General Buell, with the precise amount of force etc etc etc.—

. . .

[The last section of the omitted paragraphs is marked "*not* private" and recounts McClellan's version of a recent appearance before a congressional committee.]

(*Private*)

I cannot say that I advise the publication of the above, and I would rather deprecate it; but General McClellan permitted the use of the facts, and so I tell you. He is as guileless and innocent as a child, and we must be careful not to injure him, even to promote Herald interests.—

Please read this letter to Mr Bennett.

I asked him, to day, how often I should disturb him, and he replied:—"*Every* day. . . ."

Most truly yours

M I

IV. Malcolm Ives to James Gordon Bennett

private and confidential

Washington January 27, 1862

My dear Sir.

You will see by the following letter that I have not been idle to day. I drove almost immediately, on arriving, to Mr Stanton's house. He said that the mischievous impudence of such papers as the World, in publishing prematurely facts to the world, with regard to military and naval movements was to be put a stop to; that he had already taken measures on the subject, which would put an end to the evil "within three days."— I might as well say here, that in the conversation I had, later in the day, with General McClellan, and also with Colonel Scott, both of those gentlemen used strong language in condemning the conduct of some of our New York editors, and remarked that it must and should be reduced within proper bounds.

Mr Stanton is strongly in favor of the control of the telegraph wires being assumed by the government. He says that through means of cypher, or enigmatical language important secret information has been transmitted to the enemy, and that it must be stopped. He asked me to telegraph for the President of the Am. Tel. Co to come on to Washington, and that he would satisfy him that neither the Company nor the public would suffer by the new arrangement. As, moreover, he purposes consulting with Mr Sanford, and adopting modifications if necessary, he feels sure of giving no dissatisfaction any where.— Mr. Sanford is to arrive here on Thursday morning, and it will then be decided in detail what is to be done.

. . .

After breakfast I went to General McClellan's. I asked him, in case of the

failure of any of his expeditions, or military movements, what would be the remedy, and how far it would delay his operations in Virginia. He replied:— "Scarcely any, unless the reverse should be such a one as can be remedied without serious loss of time"; that he was making his preparations for a movement in Virginia, "in the same manner as though it were not connected with the grander scheme of campaign".— "Then", I responded, "your time for moving, on the other side of the Potomac, must be substantially fixed." The General answered:— *"Certainly,* I think, I *shall advance by the first of March, or the first days in March,* WHATEVER ELSE MAY HAPPEN."— He continued, very gravely and earnestly;— "And now I want you to tell Mr Bennett, that, when the time for immediate action comes, I want his whole support to help me throw dust in the eyes of the enemy. Together with real information, you shall have pretended information, for which you may be railed at as prematurely divulging secrets, but, if I live, the aid thus given me, shall become historical." He enlarged upon your past kindness and loyalty in sustaining his efforts, and said he should count upon your rendering, when the time came, his road to victory comparatively easy. He laughed, and rubbed his hands as he sat meditating upon the manner of leading astray his southern antagonists. I told him that, as the moment of action would be unexpected to the public, it would be well, as he wished no allusion to his plans made to any one, to point out some mode of communicating with you.— "The instant it is necessary," he said, "I will get Colburn to telegraph the two words 'Come on', and you will know what it means."

. . .

Most truly yrs

M I

V. MALCOLM IVES TO JAMES GORDON BENNETT

Confidential

My dear Sir

Have only time to say that Fox [10] is now all right. The information from the Burnside expedition was *exclusive.* It was excerpted from a confidential letter to Fox by Goldsboro.[11] Fox says he will give orders to have *everything* given to Herald— as far as he dares exclusively. He went with me to the clerks, and told them in future to give to Tracy and Whitely [12] *all* they ask for. I have directed the latter to visit each department *daily,* instead of less frequently as has been the practice.

. . .

Genl Marcy [13] has promised to spend the evening with me and the Army of Potomac matters and McClellan affairs will be established with the paper on a sure footing. . . .

. . .

[10] Gustavus Vasa Fox, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Aug. 1, 1861–May 22, 1866. His *Confidential Correspondence,* edited by Robert Means Thompson and Richard Wainwright, was published for the Naval History Society (2 vols., New York, 1918–1919).

[11] Louis M. Goldsborough, in command of the fleet sent with the Burnside expedition.

[12] Colonel Whiteley about this time became superintendent of the *Herald* correspondence in Washington.

[13] R. B. Marcy, McClellan's father-in-law, his chief of staff.

General Grant will leave Tennessee river and go up Cumberland river and take Dover at once.

Yrs m. truly

M. I.[14]

Feb. 8 1862

VI. W. H. Stiner to Frederic Hudson

Fortress Monroe Apl 12/62

F Hudson Esq

My dear Sir:

I hardly know what you will think of not receiving the details of the appearance of the rebel steamer Merrimac [15] and other vessels by the mail due at New York tonight . . . Mr Farrell was going to send all particulars pr Express, but I had a friend (a member of the firm of Sheldon and Co publishers N Y) who was going direct to N Y, and by giving it to him I expected the matter would reach you quicker. Genl Wool however became scared and at once ordered that the boat for Baltimore should not leave, but before five o'clock he recanted and annulled that order. The censor was sent to the boat, and he gave strict instructions not to publish anything relative to the movements of the day, and threatened that if anything appeared in the papers to hold us personally responsible. Mr Sheldon became frightened and refused to take my bundle and by that means I lost the opportunity of sending by Express But to day I learn that the Express Co did not send off anything whatever.

This morning Mr Sanford Telegraph Superintendent arrived here to

[14] On the same day, Saturday, Ives called at the War Department for news; on Monday, according to an order issued by Secretary Stanton, he was arrested and sent to Fort McHenry as a spy. The charge against him was that he "intruded himself into the War Department . . . for the purposes of spying and obtaining war news and intelligence . . . which he knew were not authorized to be published; and having so intruded, he conducted himself insolently, making threats . . . of the hostility of the New York *Herald* . . . unless he was afforded special privileges . . . and in advance of all other papers" (New York *Herald*, Feb. 11). This order was also published in other newspapers, but it does not appear in the correspondence of the War Department, which contains a copy of an order of arrest, directed to Major E. J. Allen, and signed by Secretary Stanton, reading: "You are hereby ordered to arrest and keep in close custody a certain person now in Washington calling himself Doct. Ives, and pretending to be the Special Agent of the New York *Herald*. Keep in close custody suffering him to hold communication with no one and convey him by the first train to Fort McHenry and deliver him into the custody of Major General Dix there to be held in close custody until discharged by order of this Department." It was stated in the other order of arrest that Mr. Ives had a brother in the Confederate army. Ives stated that he had had no communication with his brother for two years. An article of interest found in Ives's papers was a pass signed by General McClellan admitting him at all hours to the War Department (New York *Tribune*, Feb. 14). Ives was subsequently released by General Dix, the order stating that Malcolm Ives had taken "the Oath of Allegiance with special conditions". The *Herald* called the whole thing a "comedy" and explained that Ives's "only crime was a little infirmity to which he is occasionally subject"!

[15] The *Virginia* (*Merrimac*) had been repaired and strengthened since the battle of March 9 and had steamed out into Hampton Roads on April 11.

investigate the affair of the Philadelphia Enquirer. He promises to meet the Correspondents and get them to sign a *parole* and abolish the office of censor here altogether. Until that time (when he is to meet us) he will act as censor himself.

. . .

Yours Truly
Wm H Stiner

VII. T. M. Cash to Frederic Hudson

Herald Rooms New Orleans March 5th 1863

My dear Sir:—

I arrived at this place on Sunday morning last, and proceeded at once to the St Charles Hotel where I am at present located, and where I intend to remain — In a few hours afterwards I found both Mr Slack and Mr Hills to whom I delivered your letters. The latter appeared in the undress uniform of a Lieut Colonel. He hold[s] that commission in a Negro regiment that has at present no existance except in number, and of course draws the pay; he is also Chief Editor of *the Era* which paper supersedes *the Delta,* and is the organ of General Banks.[16] Mr Hills the correspondent of the Boston Journal holds a commission as 1st Lieut in the same regiment, and is also Assistant Editor of the Era — Mr Slack did not appear at all chagrined at his change of location, on the contrary, was rather pleased. I was particularly struck with his remark when he finished reading your letter. It was "I will act as correspondent in h—l if Mr. Hudson wishes me to do so" he will leave for Key West by the first vessel stopping there —

. . .

. . . Dr. Zachary, the well known chiropodist . . . accompanied me to call on General Banks by whom I have been very kindly and cordially received, as also by every member of his staff whose acquaintance I have thus far made. Every facility has been extended to me, and blank free passes have been sent me, for any of *the Heralds* employees that may wish to accompany the army, to travel by steamboat or rail road . . . .

I yesterday . . . called on Admiral Farragutt, and was by him remarkably well received. He has also extended every facility, and permits *a Herald* man to go on board of any ship I may select Dr Foltz the fleet surgeon promises to give me *ahead of all others* a full copy of all casualties. . . .

Very truly yours
Tho M Cash.

Fredk Hudson Esq.
New York.

VIII. L. A. Whiteley to Frederic Hudson

Washington Nov 29th 1863

My Dear Sir.

. . .

Nothing has been heard from Meade [17] and nothing is expected from him

[16] In December, 1862, Major General N. P. Banks had succeeded Major General B. F. Butler in command at New Orleans.

[17] Meade was then engaged in the operations against the Confederate position at Mine Run.

until he shall have arrived at Richmond or been disastrously defeated en route. . . . He does not fear to meet Lee anywhere. I shall use every effort to procure advance copies of all reports, even if it should be necessary to *pay* for obtaining them.

Y^rs very truly
L A WHITELEY.

Fred^c Hudson Esq—

IX. [ ] CADWALLADER TO FREDERIC HUDSON

Private

Head Quarters Armies of the United States,
Culpepper, May 3d 1864.

F. Hudson Esq.
Dear Sir

I arrived here yesterday and have all my arrangements as complete as it is possible to make them under existing circumstances . . . .

The army moves in the morning.[18] Gen. Meade's H'd Qrs. break up at 5 o'clock — Gen. Grant's during the day. Our troops will force a passage of the Rapidan tomorrow. Immediate, and obstinate fighting is apprehended. Burnside is in the rear as a reserve corps, and can be thrown to the right, left, or center, as demanded.

Mr. Chapman came as far as Gen. Meades Hd Qrs today. Mr. Anderson is in Culpepper. Hancock seems to have no *Herald* Cor. with him. Saw Mr. N. Davidson, and Mr. Hendricks this evening. Both are prepared for any emergency.

E. B. Washburne is here, intending to accompany Gen. Grant till a decisive battle has virtually ended the campaign.

Grant expects Lee to attempt to cut the railroad between here and Washington.

No private telegrams will be permitted to pass to Washington till further orders—which means, until three days after a battle. We shall all have to depend on mails and messengers.

The mails will probably be detained several days in Washington by governmental orders, and messengers should be dispatched daily.

Am requested to write nothing for publication till a battle has been fought.

. . .

Have just learned that Hancock is in motion, ready to attack at daylight—Sedgwick also.

CADWALLADER

X. L. A. WHITELEY TO JAMES GORDON BENNETT

Confidential

Washington D. C.
May 5 1864

My Dear Sir.

Grants, (or rather Meade's) army moved yesterday, crossed the Rapid

[18] The Wilderness campaign.

Ann river at Germana ford without opposition, the rear guard passing over early in the afternoon. . . .

[Forecast of probable movements of the armies of the Potomac, the James, and of Sherman, grotesque in the light of subsequent events, but "based upon information derived from those who last had intimate and personal communication with Grant". Guerillas had already torn up part of the railroad from Bull Run bridge to the Rappahannock, thus cutting communication with the Army of the Potomac.]

I fear that even telegraphic communication with the army will be interrupted and we shall have to depend either upon chance or (if my arrangement with Cadwallader succeeds) General Grants private mail bag to his head quarters here for all communication.

We shall be wide awake, day and night and either by telegraph or special messengers whatever we can gather, unless it should be *contraband,* when it will be sent confidentially by mail or by the arrangement made with Mr Hudson.

Yrs Very Truly

L A Whiteley

Jas Gordon Bennett Esq.-

XI. T. M. Cook to Frederic Hudson

Private

Washington, Nov. 3, 1864.

F. Hudson Esq.

Dr. Sr:—

With this I send you my account for past two months.

Asst. Secy Fox returned night before last from a visit to New York, and yesterday I had the interview with him for which Col. Whitely and Mr. Ashley were so solicitous. He seemed to be very glad to see me and was pleased at my assignment to go with the fleet. He thanked me for my Mobile Bay report, which he said was represented by all officers who had come up as a perfectly correct account of the fight. He then gave me a note to Admiral Porter simply to the effect that I wrote the best account of the Mobile Bay fight and was therefore well qualified to give a description of any other fight. I then told him my relations with Porter and that this note would do me no good; what I wanted was to be placed on the Admiral's ship with facilities at my disposal to get away north in advance of the mass of correspondents or any of them. To do this he replied that it would not do to put any such permission or arrangement in writing, but that Porter understood it and everything would be fixed to my satisfaction. I urged that I could not be satisfied until I knew what the arrangement was to be, but if it should be satisfactory I could make a report that would be acceptable both to the Admiral and the Department. Fox then said something about Dahlgren getting into a scrape by sending a Tribune correspondent away specially with important news. I insisted that I cared nothing for the scrapes of Dahlgren or the Tribune, but it might be arranged to send me to New York direct twelve hours before the Admiral should send his dispatches to Fortress Monroe and that the affair could be covered up.

Fox then promised to go to Fortress Monroe on Saturday night when we could get together with the Admiral and fix up something.

I do not believe they will give me a special boat to get away in; they are afraid to do it; but I am satisfied that I shall be on the flagship exclusively, and then if an opportunity occurs Porter will assist me in giving the other correspondents the slip.

. . .

So soon as I get things fixed with the Admiral I shall go to New York to complete arrangements with you. In case of failure to get a special boat from the navy I believe you will make the grandest strike of the age by sending me down a boat as suggested in my last. The Herald could boast of such a piece of enterprise for years to come. But I yet think the Navy Department could be induced to procure for us an outside vessel which we might call our own were Ashley or some other person who is on confidential terms there authorized to promise Fox that thereafter he and the Department would be exempt from attacks in the columns of the Herald — This hint is, of course, *sub rosa*—

Yours Very Respectly

T. M. Cook [19]

[19] At the Battle of Chancellorsville Cook had also enjoyed unusual opportunities for observation, for he had carried dispatches for General D. E. Sickles, commander of the Third Corps. *Official Records, War of the Rebellion,* first series, XXV. 395.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Excavations at Olynthus. Part V., *Mosaics, Vases, and Lamps.* Part VI., *Coins.* By David M. Robinson, Ph.D., L.H.D., LL.D. With a chapter on Pre-Persian Pottery by G. E. Mylonas, a chapter on Lamps by J. Walter Graham, and a chapter on Byzantine Vases by A. Xyngopoulos. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1933. Pp. xxi, 297, 209 plates; ix, 111, 30 plates. $15.00; $10.00.)

To Professor Robinson's energy and enthusiasm, assisted by a grant of $5000 from the American Council of Learned Societies, we are indebted for two more volumes on his excavations at Olynthus. At least one additional volume is promised; without that, he has used more than one thousand pages and about eight hundred plates and illustrations in the six parts that have already appeared. They sell for $72.50. One may properly ask whether a more rigid selection of material and a less discursive type of presentation would not be equally valuable for scientific purposes, and much less expensive.

Part V. is devoted chiefly to the pottery found in the campaigns of 1928 and 1931. There is an introductory chapter on Olynthian mosaics, and a supplementary chapter by J. Walter Graham on the lamps found in 1931. Pre-Persian pottery is discussed by G. E. Mylonas, and Byzantine pottery by A. Xyngopoulos. The rest of the book is by Professor Robinson. The ordinary reader will be more interested in the lessons which the broken pots teach than in the thousand odd pieces of the ceramic industry laboriously described and reproduced on the plates which close the volume. Possibly the most important lesson which Professor Robinson would have us draw from the pots is that Olynthus ceased to exist after its destruction by Philip in 348 B. C., a theme to which he constantly recurs in the face of adverse criticism. If he is right, archæologists now have material more or less exactly dated in the first half of the fourth century, or earlier, with which to compare finds from other sites. So the mosaics which Professor Robinson found in several Olynthian houses are dated by the pottery found lying broken above them before the capture of the city by Philip. Colored photographs of these mosaics are a particularly attractive feature of the book.

Professor Mylonas's chapter on pre-Persian pottery is valuable historically for the light it throws on the relations of Olynthus with Macedonia, Cyprus, and the eastern Ægean, from the end of the second millennium B. C. to the destruction of the city by the Persians in 479 B. C. Mylonas suggests that the earliest Olynthian pottery was produced by a Greek people closely related to

the tribes occupying central Macedonia during the early Iron Age. Most of the pre-Persian pottery found at Olynthus is attributed to local artisans, largely on the evidence of the silvery mica which characterizes the native clay. Under the influence of the eastern Ægean and Cypriote fabrics local potters developed an Olynthian style which displayed late Helladic technique and Mycenæan motives, particularly during the Bottiæan occupation (700–500 B. C.). Wares imported from, or produced under the influence of, Eubœa, Attica, and Corinth were found in lesser quantities. Corinth probably exercised her influence through her colony Potidæa, situated not far from Olynthus; and Eubœa through its settlements in other parts of the Chalcidic peninsula.

The largest part of the volume is given over to a catalogue of fifth and fourth century pottery found during the two campaigns. Much of this was locally produced. Of the imported wares, probably most came from Attica. In a few cases Professor Robinson has ventured to attribute vases to one or another of the well-known artists. An important group of vases resembles so closely the so-called Apulian style as to suggest to their discoverer that there was an extensive export of Olynthian ware across Macedonia and the Adriatic to Italy. Since the Olynthian vases of this type contain the characteristic local mica, Robinson argues that the trade was not from Italy to Olynthus, "especially as we have no South Italian coins at Olynthus".

Part VI., a descriptive catalogue of the coins found in 1931, is, from the point of view of numismatics, disappointing. The plates are particularly inadequate. Possibly the fault lies with the engraver. In any case, comparison between Robinson's illustrations and those which appear in the monographs of the American Numismatic Society will show what can be accomplished by using good casts, properly photographed and reproduced by modern methods.

Historically the coins provide further evidence that Olynthus ceased to exist after its destruction in 348 B. C. and the incorporation of its territory in the Macedonian kingdom. The great majority of coins found on the site can be readily dated before 348 B. C., and of those which previously have been assigned to a later period a large number can be shifted upward to suit the new evidence. Bronze coins are notoriously hard to date. The few remaining pieces posterior to 348 B. C. can be explained as chance deposits. The absence of coins from Macedonian mints after Philip can be adduced to support Professor Robinson's thesis, for after Philip conquered Chalcidice Macedonian mints undoubtedly provided an increasingly large part of the money circulating there. Professor Robinson's tables of coins found in 1928 and 1931 show that more than two thousand, out of 2400 identifiable coins, were minted in Chalcidice and Macedonia before 348. About 260 of them were issued by Macedonian kings. In contrast with this record, the same region for the period between Philip and the Roman conquest is represented by six

coins, one issued by Alexander the Great, five bearing the monogram used by Antigonus Gonatas and Antigonus Doson.

The two volumes betray a certain haste in composition and proof reading. So the geographical tabulation of mints (Part VI., pp. 6 f.) places the Thracian Neapolis in Chalcidice, the Chalcidic Dicæa in Thrace, as also on page 5, and Ægina in Attica, although on pp. 81 and 86 Dicæa and Neapolis are correctly located. The table omits Myrina in Lemnos and the Macedonian kings, Alexander the Great, Antigonus Gonatas, and Antigonus Doson.

The University of Cincinnati. ALLEN B. WEST.

King Agis of Sparta and his Campaign in Arkadia in 418 B. C. By W. J. WOODHOUSE. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1933. Pp. viii, 161. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

THIS carefully constructed and extremely well-written monograph deals with an important occurrence in the Peloponnesian War that has been notoriously neglected by the historian and the student of military affairs. In *Thucydides,* v. 61–75, we have a strangely confused and contradictory account of the events which culminated in the first battle of Mantineia, 418 B.C., between the Spartan allies and the Mantineian-Argive Confederacy. The Lacedæmonian army, as the historian represents it, invades the plain of Mantineia; is about to attack the confederates, but is dissuaded by the peevish exclamation of an old and disgruntled soldier; marches toward Tegea; tries to flood the plain by stopping the natural passages of the river nearby; returns and altogether unexpectedly encounters the confederate army which it routs with some difficulty.

The Spartan tactics are faulty. Their line is dislocated before the armies even clash. The weak left wing is well-nigh destroyed, and only a desperate wheeling of the center and right to aid their comrades saves the situation from complete disaster. But the losses of the Spartans (and this is the amazing thing) are placed at less than half that of the allies!

All through, the Spartan leader, King Agis, whom Thucydides very obviously does not like, is made to act the part of the blundering, vacillating, and incompetent commander, who muddles through to victory in spite of, rather than by virtue of, his leadership.

In a fashion reminiscent of Grundy and his handling of various military situations in Herodotus, Professor Woodhouse attempts to read sense into a series of passages which upon careful analysis appear little better than nonsensical. He shows that Thucydides was at fault in accepting, uncritically, vague accounts of the campaign that must have reached him from eyewitnesses, it is true, but men quite incapable of appreciating the finer principles of military strategy and tactics. The whole thing seems actually to have developed out of a careful and scientific plan in the mind of Agis: a preliminary reconnoiter that found the confederates strongly posted on an eminence; a

feint toward their position and a feigned retreat; a well-calculated return when the enemy had left their favorable ground; and an attack that lacked none of the elements of precision.

The sole disturbance to the perfect coördination of the Spartan military machine came about through the action of the Polemarchs, Aristokles and Hipponoidas, who stubbornly refused to swing their battalions into the gap that occurred between the left wing and the center of Agis's force. But the Spartan king, with admirable judgment, triumphantly met this awkward situation by swinging round his victorious main body to aid this discomfited sector.

The result of Professor Woodhouse's examination is a complete vindication of the strategy and tactics of the Spartan king, who emerges as a military leader of exceptional efficiency and even brilliance.

The book will prove extremely irritating to those scholars who continue to repose an undying faith in the infallibility of Thucydides. By those who are ready to concede that the work of this historian is uneven in merit, or that he suffers an occasional lapse in his ability to appraise a situation, military or otherwise, the work will be welcomed as one that provides a rational explanation for a campaign that has hitherto been shrouded in heavy mists of obscurity.

The University of Virginia. A. D. Fraser.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères des origines à nos jours. Par Stephen d'Irsay. Tome I., *Moyen Age et Renaissance.* (Paris: Auguste Picard. 1933. Pp. xii, 372. 47 fr. 50.)

This is the first part of a projected two-volume work surveying in some 800 pages the history of universities in Europe and beyond the seas from their beginnings to the present. The second volume will furnish a full index and the bibliography. The subtitle of the first volume has to be stretched a bit, since it has to cover the chapters on the Protestant and the Catholic Reformations. In evaluating the published volume it is fair to distinguish the major portion, for which the *bahnbrechende* Denifle and Rashdall smoothed the way, from the chapters on the Reformations, where the author has to make more of his own road.

Origins are handled in a superior fashion. New lights and shifts of emphasis are frequent. The absorption of Italy and Germany in the investiture struggle is suggested as partly explaining the "jump" which France had in the establishment of her great university. Human dissection was introduced in Bologna, Montpellier, and Lerida in the fourteenth century. From this century onward the professors ceased to be dependent on fees. In this century too the national and city states were conscious that the universities

could be used for national purposes; their great days of autonomy were over. Fuller attention might well have been given to the nature of the decline of philosophy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. "Ce malaise des intellectuels est dû, entre autres causes, à cet intellectualisme exclusif, à ce fier rationalisme, orgueil des écoles, et une conséquence peut-être de la disparition de l'augustinisme des universités" (p. 195). This is excellent but not enough. Nor does it help much to blame "néo-platonisme esthétique et vague" (p. 252). Terminism, with its lead toward experiment (Jean Buridan!), is not so much as mentioned.

The old diatribe against the universities for slowness in accepting Humanism is disposed of handily (pp. 235, 243, 297 *et passim*). The damage which Protestantism with its "hatred of reason" wrought might have been balanced with an estimate of the positive services which it performed; but not a hint of this is offered. The progressiveness of Salamanca is admirably brought out. The reforming statutes, followed by the constitutions of 1561–1562, approved by Philip II., mark its most brilliant epoch. The statutes prescribed Copernicus in astronomy and Vesalius in anatomy, and human dissections were obligatory. Alcalá was perhaps the first city to have a "feminine college".

The author's style is becomingly unobstrusive. There is, however, a certain occasional repetitiousness (*e.g.*, p. 76) which economy of space ought to have obviated. Drowsiness at the intellectual switch appears now and then. The universities of the later Middle Ages were indispensable organs of social life; "cependant, certaines des plus nobles activités et aspirations du genre humain, la mystique, le labeur manuel, la poésie, restaient souvent en dehors" (p. 222; corrected p. 244). It is to be hoped so. Frederick Barbarossa's grant of special privileges to the foreign students at Bologna is again alleged, in the face of Denifle, p. 48, and Rashdall, vol. I, p. 145. "Le XV^{e} siècle est la grande époque d'expansion commerciale: le siècle des villes prospères . . ." (p. 197). Shades of the living Pirenne! One last illustration: Cardinal Ximenes "put (de 1514 à 1517) publier . . . le magnifique bible polyglotte plusieurs années avant les éditions d'Érasme et de Mélanchthon (pp. 339–340).

The chief lacuna for the reviewer is the absence of any estimate of the absolute and comparative merits of Aristotelianism and Humanism; their values are taken for granted. It may be that the author reserves this estimate for treatment in connection with the introduction of modern science into the curriculum. If so, a hint or two may not be amiss. Whitehead points out the serious defects of the Aristotelian logical tool, and the ultimate scientific value of the Neoplatonic dream, in the remarkable seventh chapter of his *Adventures of Ideas*. And the lamented Rashdall observed (*Cambridge Medieval History*, VI. 599–600) that "it may be questioned whether the intellectual exercise involved in the study of Aristotle, in familiarity with the technicalities of scholastic Logic and in the practice of scholastic disputation, was not at least as valuable a training for the intellectual work of practical life as the

later education which consisted in intimate acquaintance with a very small number of Latin classics, a much slighter study of Greek, and unlimited practice in the art of writing Latin verse".

The general reader will get a broadly satisfactory picture and the specialist precious references from this volume. The second volume with its systematic bibliographies, taken in conjunction with Powicke's revision of Rashdall, now about due, will afford further reason for solid thanks. The reviewer's chief regret is the ill health which has robbed us of Haskins's magisterial judgment on this volume of D'Irsay.

The University of Wisconsin. G. C. SELLERY.

Scottish Abbeys and Social Life. By G. G. COULTON, Litt.D., Hon. D.Litt., F.B.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. viii, 293. $3.00.)

THE object of the Rhind Lectures, delivered in Edinburgh in 1931, of which this volume is an enlargement, was to make clear the position of Scottish monasteries in the general history of monasticism. Like all Dr. Coulton's books it is delightful reading, abounding in the vivid detail and illustration that come only from much learning and an amazing breadth of reading. St. Cuthbert and the salmon, St. Columba's old white horse, and a multitude of other examples of medieval stories convey to us much of the spice and flavor of life in those days, while the interpretation of material shows Dr. Coulton's power of appreciation of the continuity and depth of human nature. It must be said, however, that here as in Dr. Coulton's other works, the organization of material is confusing, and in the abundance of illustration the main theme is sometimes obscured. Again the frequent shift from century to century is a little dazzling. The so-called Middle Ages provide a very long period for generalization; and even allowing for the continuance of medieval conditions in Scotland, yet a large amount of the evidence offered is of late centuries, when a loosening of discipline and lowering of monastic aims was evident everywhere.

In his discussion of the phases of monastic life characteristic of Scotland Dr. Coulton treads carefully and enters for a short distance only on the "holy ground" of the Celtic period. He describes briefly the "familial" arrangement whereby the monastery belonged to a family and the office of abbot was hereditary in that family. He mentions the large number of double monasteries for women as well as men, the peculiar position of the bishop who was in some matters under the abbot's jurisdiction, and the recognition of marriage of the clergy. His real concern, however, begins with the introduction of the Benedictine order in the time of Malcolm and Margaret, and its rapid extension after the entrance of the Cluniacs and Cistercians, and with the later coming of the Augustinians. By the end of the thirteenth century the

land was clothed with the "white robe of churches", practically all the sixty-nine foundations being in existence, and the friars also having established themselves. The amount of wealth in the hands of the Church was very great for so small and poor a country, but in certain matters the monasteries were at a disadvantage as compared with those of other countries. The *in commendam* system and absentee landlordism flourished, and the visitatorial arrangements were so inadequate that little discipline was maintained, and the paid informer, little known in England, was often rewarded with the office against whose incumbent he had given information. One matter mentioned by Dr. Coulton is of great interest and deserves more study than has ever been put on it, namely, the great importance of assarts in a waste country, and the relation of such *défrichement* to the improved status of the peasantry. As in France, the interaction of approvement of waste and disappearance of serfdom is worthy of consideration.

Much of what Dr. Coulton says of monasticism in Scotland is true of the movement elsewhere, and he repeats some of the criticisms and warnings regarding it that we have read in his other books. Undoubtedly the great amount of evidence must be studied critically, and caution observed lest one ascribe too much of the actual building, art, education, poor relief, improved agriculture, to the monks themselves. Yet the cathedral remains an expression of medieval religious life, even if masons' marks indicate hired labor, and the evidence might with justice be considered in the light of achievement as well as in that of negative criticism. It is to meet comment of this kind, probably, that Dr. Coulton repeats several times his "reasoned judgement" of the value of the Church. "I regard monasticism as one of the great formative forces in the social life of the Middle Ages . . . and at certain times and in certain places I would call it even the greatest and most beneficent force." Again, "if at any time I seem to say anything incompatible with this central judgement . . . then the contradiction will be involuntary. . . . The monk's ideal was good, that is our starting point—but good is always comparative".

Mount Holyoke College. N. Neilson.

William Marshal, Knight-Errant, Baron, and Regent of England. By Sidney Painter, Associate in History in The Johns Hopkins University. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1933. Pp. xi, 305. $3.00.)

Seldom do the careers of men whose names appear on the pages devoted to English history in the twelfth century lend themselves to biographical treatment. Even those whose names are writ large, unless they were kings or saints, usually occupied the attention of a contemporary historian only when their deeds touched the main stream of events under consideration. We meet a statesman here, we meet him again there; of what transpired between we learn naught. The biography which can ordinarily be compiled

from such sources is both fragmentary and colorless. The life of William Marshal constitutes an exception, because it became the theme of an unknown trouvère who wrote a rhymed chronicle soon after William's death. In addition to this fundamental material, Mr. Painter has accumulated numerous details from general chronicles and official documents. His biography is the product of skillful interpretation and combination of this evidence. Though it necessarily provides less information about a few periods and events in William's career than the reader might desire, it leaves no complete gaps of great significance. From its readable pages emerges an eminently human figure.

As the fourth son of a minor baron, William Marshal began his career without particularly brilliant prospects. In his youth he was trained to the profession of arms by his uncle, the lord of Tancarville in Normandy, who gave him knighthood in anticipation of a campaign against the French, which Mr. Painter places in 1167. For over twenty years he followed his profession assiduously in wars and tournaments, winning renown for his prowess and a high reputation for loyalty. Though he was a trusted member of the household of the young King Henry during a large part of the period, he rarely took a leading part in those affairs which historians of the period emphasized. This part of his career consequently has not before been treated by secondary historians with such fullness as Mr. Painter accords it. As he tells the story, it becomes an interesting exposition of the practice of chivalry as distinguished from its theory.

In 1189 William was permitted to marry the heiress of the deceased earl of Pembroke as a reward for his services to Henry II. The event marked a decisive change in his fortunes. The knight who for the greater part of his life had been landless became one of the most powerful of the major barons of the realm. He was, moreover, one of the most influential. During the whole of Richard's reign and a large part of John's he was the trusted agent and counselor of his sovereign, and during the first three years of the reign of Henry III. he acted as regent. The events of major importance in these later years of his life have therefore found their way into the histories of the period. The present biographer adds to our knowledge of this portion of William's career in two particulars. He has discovered many details which not only help to round out the biography but also reflect occasional light on other aspects of the history of the period. In some places he has given new interpretations of the known evidence. The beginning of the earl's fall from John's favor is a case in point. As the incident has previously been explained, William, with John's consent, did homage to Philip Augustus for his Norman lands in 1205. Subsequently John brought the accusation that the act had been done to his disadvantage. The suggestion that John had expected William to perform ordinary homage, leaving John his liege lord, whereas William had rendered to Philip "liege homage on this side of the sea", makes

John's accusation intelligible. Though these additions are of value, the author's chief contribution is to enlarge our knowledge of feudal society by portraying admirably the life of a man whose career illustrated so many aspects of it.

Haverford College. W. E. LUNT.

The Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation: a Study of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. By HOWARD L. GRAY, Marjorie Walter Goodhart Professor of History, Bryn Mawr College. [Harvard Historical Studies, XXXIV.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1932. Pp. xviii, 423. $4.00.)

RECENT studies of the medieval Parliament have not failed to quicken interest in every pertinent discovery and new point of view. Of all phases of the subject the most elusive is that of procedure and the legislative influence of the Commons, which is now for the first time adequately treated. For the best known records, like the Rolls of Parliament and the Statutes of the Realm, instead of minutes consist substantially of *res gestae* as selected, condensed, and arranged for final engrossment. Anterior to all enrollments are the original petitions, drafts of statutes, and remnants of litigation such as abound in the Ancient Petitions and Parliamentary Proceedings, which have been sedulously compiled and made accessible in the Public Record Office. It is from these intractable materials, sometimes abundant and sometimes meager, that the author has extorted the evidence pertaining especially to the initial and intermediate stages of action that remain unnoticed in the rolls. The fortunate discovery also of a descriptive treatise by a parliamentarian of the seventeenth century, the earliest of its kind, affords a method of attack, whereby after the noted example of Seebohm and Maitland one proceeds from the well-known of a certain date retrogressively to the less known of an earlier time. Thus from 1620 the investigation is carried backward to 1509, to 1422, and even to 1305.

To mention a few of the results that seem to the reviewer best attested, there is in the Stuart period the accepted rule of three readings during the passage of a bill. Examining its antecedents, one finds the same usage set forth with less emphasis in the Lords' Journal and the Rolls of 1509, while still more faintly in the fourteenth century, plural readings, although not necessarily three, are observed from time to time with no contemporary stress before the practice became settled. In like manner the difference between the qualified acceptance of a bill and a positive amendment was slowly realized. Striking diversities of procedure are traced in the five classes of bills that emerge, each with a mark of identification whether in the style of address, the indorsement, a tag, or a formula of acceptance. The celebrated act of Henry V., marking the so-called change from legislation by petition to legislation by bill, loses its traditional importance as soon as we find that bill and

petition were synonymous terms. Moreover, since in making the statutes there continued to be alterations without resubmission, little if any change of usage is to be attributed to the act.

Finally, the whole work may be regarded as an argument for the legislative activity of Parliament, and an offset to the emphasis of judicial supremacy as taught by Pollard and McIlwain. The independent spirit of the Commons Dr. Gray believes to have been greater than has usually been conceded. The current belief that the Commons acted under the instigation of lords starts from a few isolated instances, which are not sufficient to warrant any sweeping inference. Whether such a degree of legislative independence is to be taken as a measure of the social and political importance of the Commons, the reviewer is disposed to doubt. For in all these times legislation was remedial rather than constructive, and the Commons more than the Lords were the aggrieved classes. While no exception need be taken in respect of citations, translations, and references, fault may be found that such a compendium of parliamentary history should be given only a meager index.

Vassar College. J. F. Baldwin.

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Erasmi opuscula: a Supplement to the Opera omnia. Edited with Introductions and Notes by Wallace K. Ferguson, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in New York University. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1933. Pp. xiii, 373. 10 fl.)

Professor Ferguson has placed all Erasmian scholars under obligation by this careful and well-balanced piece of work. The fourteen short treatises and poems here presented are not discoveries, in the sense of being brought to light for the first time, but they form a real contribution to knowledge by making accessible a body of material hitherto scattered, inadequately edited, and lacking the final touch of recent scholarship. Their purpose, as outlined to the author by Dr. Preserved Smith, was to complete the great Leyden edition of the *Opera omnia* by adding the text of minor works omitted, for one reason or another, from that monumental collection.

This involved a rather nice problem of selection. Some of the works were anonymous but generally ascribed to Erasmus on account of their agreement with his opinions or resemblances of style. Dr. Ferguson has examined the evidence in each case and accepted or rejected as the burden of proof seemed to require. Like all who have to deal with that very slippery reporter of his own activities and his own relations with other persons he has found it necessary to make allowances and balance interpretations with due regard to circumstances of time and place and the personal equation.

The arrangement of the several works is mainly chronological. Each is preceded by an introduction giving the historical background and a brief sur-

vey of the discussions as to authorship, credibility, and purpose of composition. This is followed by a comprehensive note on the several editions, including also manuscripts, where these are in existence. Variant readings in the different editions are given in the footnotes. Here also are copious explanatory references to events and to the literature of the special subject referred to. Each person mentioned in the text is described in a note. We have thus a running commentary which takes the place of a bibliography and of an elaborate index.

For his historical references Dr. Ferguson relies mainly upon the standard histories, Creighton, Pastor, Gregorovius, or Ranke. On controversial points he follows generally the opinions of the late Professor Percy S. Allen, editor of the Erasmian letters, whose lamented death (June 16, 1933) occurred too late for mention in this volume. As to the central Erasmian problem, the relation of the great scholar to the Lutheran reforms, our author is inclined to a rather generous view of his sincerity and to ascribe many of the apparent contradictions of statement to honest change of opinions rather than to timidity or dread of persecution. The most important, as well as the longest of the treatises here given is the *Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Edwardi Lei,* in which Erasmus's talent for vituperative argument finds one of its most vigorous expressions. Lee's attacks had touched his most sensitive spot, his quality as a scholar, and no weapon was too savage to be used in repelling them. Dr. Ferguson's analysis of the controversy is eminently fair to both sides, and his accompanying notes are among the most instructive in the whole volume.

Harvard University. EPHRAIM EMERTON.

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus: ausgewählte Werke. Im Gemeinschaft mit ANNEMARIE HOLBORN, herausgegeben von HAJO HOLBORN.

Johann Cuspinians Briefwechsel. Gesammelt, herausgegeben und erläutert von Dr. HANS ANKWICZ VON KLEEHOVEN, Oberstaatsbibliothekar in Wien. (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1933. Pp. xviii, 329; xviii, 239. 16 and 15 M.)

Petrus Canisius als humanistisch Geleerde. Door Dr. J. H. M. TESSER, S. J. (Amsterdam: H. J. Paris. 1932. Pp. xviii, 282. 4.90 fl.)

THE three volumes cited above are of very different character and scope, but all three find a common denominator in the Christian Humanism of Northern Europe during the sixteenth century.

The volume of selected works of Erasmus, edited by Annemarie and Hajo Holborn, contains nothing that will be new to Erasmian scholars. Yet it is a book that many will welcome eagerly; for here the editors present in very convenient form a carefully corrected text of some of the most significant

writings of the great Dutch Humanist, which have hitherto been available only in the *Opera omnia* or in earlier and more rare editions. The volume includes those works which—with the exception of the *Encomium Moriae,* so often republished that a new edition would be superfluous—best set forth Erasmus's conception of the *philosophia Christi.* More clearly than any other writer of his age, Erasmus perceived the possibilities for reform that lay in a happy combination of classical Humanism and the scholarly study of evangelical Christianity, when the results of both were used for the critical analysis of contemporary spiritual life. The first fruit of that ideal was the *Enchiridion militis Christiani,* here published with the significant prefatory epistle to Paul Volz of the 1518 edition. It was followed, as in this volume, by the prefaces to the first edition of the Erasmian New Testament and the fuller *Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam,* in which Erasmus expressed his conviction of the necessity of scholarly criticism and understanding of the Biblical texts as a basis for theology and as a guide to Christian living. The editors have been sparing in their annotations, but they have noted the source of all quotations and references in the text, and have added an index that should be of great assistance to the student.

Dr. H. A. von Kleehoven's edition of the correspondence of Johann Cuspinian contains more that is new, but nothing comparable in value to the Erasmian works. Nevertheless, the sixty-four letters, twenty of which are here published for the first time, to and from the Viennese diplomat, Humanist, and historian should interest any student of the period. They fall within the first three decades of the sixteenth century and deal with a variety of subjects—diplomatic correspondence arising from Cuspinian's numerous trips to Hungary and elsewhere as ambassador for the emperor, exchange of literary news with other scholars, inquiries regarding manuscripts, and reports on the progress of the writer's own works. Among the Humanists with whom Cuspinian corresponded were Aldus Manutius, Pirkheimer, Reuchlin, Joachim Vadian, Jakob Villinger, and Christoph Scheurl, while both sides of the religious controversy of the day were represented by Johann Eck and Martin Luther respectively. The text is fully and carefully annotated, with all the necessary critical apparatus.

The purpose of Dr. Tesser's monograph on his famous fellow countryman and fellow Jesuit is to study the non-theological interests of Canisius, his classical scholarship and the influence of Humanism upon his thought. The author regards Canisius not as a pioneer, but as the representative of a movement begun before his time. The first part of the book, therefore, is taken up with a study of early Christian Humanism, among the Brethren of the Common Life, who set the tone of his youthful environment, and in the University of Cologne, where he received his education. It concludes with an analysis of Canisius's attitude toward Erasmus, a curious mixture of

admiration for his unrivaled learning and literary skill and of contempt for his supposed instability and weakness of character, a judgment with which the author is evidently in full agreement. Dr. Tesser has leaned heavily, as is proper, on the recent edition of Canisius's works, edited by O. Braunsberger, 1896–1923. He cites also an imposing list of manuscript sources and an extensive bibliography, with, however, some regrettable lacunæ.

New York University. WALLACE K. FERGUSON.

Histoire de Rome: Les pontificats d'Adrien VI. et de Clément VII. Par E. RODOCANACHI, membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Librairie Hachette. 1933. Pp. 292. 80 fr.)

M. RODOCANACHI's *Histoire de Rome,* of which this is the fourth volume to be reviewed in this journal, gains a certain impetus as it proceeds. The narrative is still placid, unimaginative, and circumstantial; but it has now a growing authority from the constant employment of contemporary accounts, letters, and diaries, checked by archival material. There is the usual ample bibliography, the usual succession of excellent and often unusual illustrations, and the usual (though not consistent) forcing of Italian names into French. The question whether a work so splendidly caparisoned is to be taken seriously may be answered in the affirmative if it is understood that we have not before us a work of unique value. As in the case of its predecessors by the same hand, it is more than the title implies and less than the subject calls for. On Rome, properly speaking, there are only a few pages on the "Conseil communal", part of a chapter on "La vie à Rome" which is really concerned mostly with "Politique extérieure" and slightly with "La réforme en Italie". However, if *Ubi papa, ibi Roma* holds good, the title is explained, together with the fact that, while the sack of Rome has due space, the siege of Florence is barely mentioned, though the plan of the work would seem to call for both.

Of the two popes presented, Adrian VI. is awarded a chapter on his "vie antérieure"—the table of contents reads "vie intérieure"—while Clement VII. does not gain such attention, probably because he had been so long identified with the *Curia.* Adrian's sudden election was accounted for by the intervention of the Holy Ghost (p. 18); but the imperial ambassador, Don Juan Manuel—called "ambassadeur d' Allemagne" and (on p. 70) "Don Manuel" —was given second place in bringing it about (p. 39). Adrian's education at Deventer is mentioned as briefly by Rodocanachi (p. 23) as by Hyma (*Christian Renaissance,* p. 247), whom the author does not cite either in the text or in the bibliography. Nor does he say anything of the new college of Louvain, of which Hyma says Adrian was put in charge.

Clement VII. is condemned for irresolution; friends and enemies alike counted on his changing his mind (p. 101). He had no opinion of his own and followed the advice of the last counselor, with the result that his policy was timorous and uncertain (p. 224). His conduct toward his native city

would be astonishing were it not that of the *fuorusciti* of all times (p. 247). He told the Florentine ambassador that he would subjugate the republic if he had to pledge or sell his tiara to do it. As to a reformation, he wished for one with ardor, according to Contarini, without doing anything to realize it (p. 235); and the Mantuan ambassador says of the decrees issued after the sack of Rome: "fine and good and praiseworthy, supposing they last and are not treated *à l'usage de Rome,* where an ordinance and an edict last three days and no more". To Clement the theories of Copernicus seemed curious and not in contradiction to the teachings of religion (p. 100). He gave opportunity to Johann Widmanstadt, who came to Rome in 1533, to explain them in the presence of the pope, two cardinals, some bishops, and the papal physician. He made him his private secretary and presented him with a manuscript containing the work of a Greek astronomer. This is now at Munich, and in the preface Widmanstadt recalls his reception by the pontiff.

The long chapter on the capture and sack of Rome is justified by the use of little known sources, already pointed out in the author's *Rome au temps de Jules II. et de Léon X.* (1911), which included the sack of 1527. Of these is a German letter, the work doubtless of one of the *landsquenets,* an eye-witness (p. 183, n.). Very vivid is his narrative of the crowd pressing before the postern of the "Château Saint-Ange", the Roman cannoneers firing through the fog, the cardinals held for ransom and dragged through the streets, and the nuns of S. Cosimato picking their way over the corpses in the darkness; but the climax is in the notarial acts from the Capitoline archives regarding the ransoms and exactions levied on the wretched victims (p. 199). Romans thus mulcted are protesting three years later at being called upon to redeem their promises, and sending a commission to the pope to demand that these be annulled as made under duress. Through the events of these years run strange fevers of speculation. In 1523 there were bets on who would be the successful candidate in the papal election; how long the conclave would last; what would be the nationality of the successful candidate (p. 94). In 1525 Romans were laying wagers on the outcome of the expedition of Stuart to Naples (p. 130).

Inaccuracies are more seeming than real. The reference in a footnote on p. 78 to "Joachim I^{er}, roi de Prusse" is startling, but the citation is from an eighteenth century Polish work. Giulia Gonzaga was sister of a cardinal, but not of *the* cardinal Gonzaga (Ercole), as is implied (p. 226). The Duke of Albany was the uncle of Catherine de' Medici (p. 257) only in the sense that he had been the husband of her mother's sister. "S. Jacques de Spatha" is an unexpected designation of the Order of Santiago (p. 44), but the words of a papal bull are apparently translated.

The University of Idaho. FREDERIC C. CHURCH.

De jure belli libri tres. By ALBERICO GENTILI. Volume I., *A Photographic Reproduction of the Edition of 1612.* Volume II., *A Translation of the Text,* by JOHN C. ROLFE, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in the University of Pennsylvania, and an Introduction by Coleman Phillipson, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Classics of International Law, edited by James Brown Scott.] (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. vi, 742; 51a, vii, 479. $8.00.)

THE publication by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace of Gentili's *De jure belli libri tres* is an important addition to its series of the classics of international law. The photographic reproduction of the 1612 edition (the second printed at Hanau, Prussia) is well done, resulting in an unusually clear and satisfactory page. The excellent translation by Professor Rolfe is the first into English of this first comprehensive work on the law of nations to be written in England. Modern interest in Gentili is due largely to the late Professor T. E. Holland, successor after three centuries to the Italian and Protestant jurist (1552–1608) in the Regius Professorship of Civil Law at Oxford. Holland acclaimed Gentili as the real founder of modern international law and as more than a precursor of Grotius. The only modern Latin text of the *De jure belli libri tres* is that edited by Holland and published in 1877. To the present edition an introduction is contributed by Coleman Phillipson, an amplification and revision of the essay by him which appeared originally in the *Journal of Comparative Legislation* and later was reprinted in *Great Jurists of the World* (Boston, 1914).

Gentili was the first systematic writer upon the law of nations to take a secular point of view. His method was primarily juristic rather than moralistic. He was also the first writer upon the subject who may be classed as a positivist. His English successor, Richard Zouche, averred in 1650 that Gentili "weighed his statements in the scales of law, Grotius in those of reason". In fact, the methods of the two writers were not so diverse as Zouche the positivist declared. Both Grotius and Gentili buttressed their arguments with the authority of classical writers. Gentili added copious modern instances, a practice which Grotius eschewed in his *De jure belli ac pacis* until he inserted additional footnotes in the last editions revised by him. Grotius has been charged with an indebtedness to Gentili to an extent beyond that acknowledged by him, but in the Prolegomena to his *De jure belli ac pacis,* he wrote:

> Knowing that others can derive profit from Gentili's painstaking, as I acknowledge that I have, I leave it to his readers to pass judgment on the shortcomings of his work as regards method of exposition, arrangement of matter, delimitation of inquiries, and distinctions between the various kinds of law. This only I shall say, that in treating controversial questions it is his

frequent practice to base his conclusions on a few examples, which are not in all cases worthy of approval, or even to follow the opinions of modern jurists, formulated in arguments of which not a few were accommodated to the special interests of clients, not to the nature of that which is equitable and upright. . . . Gentili outlined certain general classes, in the manner which seemed to him best; but he did not so much as refer to many topics which have come up in notable and frequent controversies.

Grotius's opinion of Gentili would seem to be fairly vindicated by a comparison of the two writers. It may be added that Gentili rarely elaborated his argument. He preferred to state his position, criticize contending positions, and support his own by a myriad of examples, ancient and modern. Grotius likewise burdened his pages with examples, but, perhaps "weighing his statements in the scales of reason", tended also to detail his argument.

The translation of Professor Rolfe leaves little to be desired. It is literal enough to be accurate, free enough to be readable, and as far as the text permits, lively. Some question might be made as to the translation here and there of *jus gentium* into international law. The time honored equivalent, law of nations, is perhaps safer, for it may mean either the law between states or the law common to nations. The context frequently indicates in which of the two senses *jus gentium* is to be taken. There are indeed some passages in which the phrase has both meanings. Attention should be called to the careful emendations of Professor Rolfe in his lengthy list of errata in the 1612 edition, at the close of volume I., and to the excellent index to the English translation.

The University of Michigan. J. S. Reeves.

The Loyal Clans. By Audrey Cunningham, M.A., F.R.Hist.S., Girton College. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. viii, 590. $9.00.)

Miss Cunningham has traced highland history through the course of three centuries to explain the cause for the allegiance of those clans which were loyal to the later Stuart kings and pretenders. Convinced that it was not unreasoned sentimentality, as Jacobite writers have maintained, or unscrupulous exploitation of the clans by their chiefs, as others have held, she finds that they acted from a belief "well grounded in reason and experience", for they had "learned to find a protector in the king from the legalised oppression of feudal superiors". In the essential opposition between feudal and patriarchal institutions, the former based primarily on a system of land tenure which defined the relationship of vassal and superior, the latter founded on a personal tie between clansman and chief, she discovers the solution of her problem. Too often the overlordship of the land occupied by a clan was not placed in the person of the chief to whom the clan owed natural allegiance. Early Stuart kings were forced by their own weakness to use great nobles in the task of keeping order, but from the time when the king's power was strengthened and made independent of the nobility, particularly by the union

of the crowns in 1603, Miss Cunningham describes a fairly unbroken series of efforts on the part of the monarchs to abolish feudal superiorities and jurisdictions and to raise the clans to a position of direct dependence on the crown. Although civil disturbances in England and the peculiar forms of Covenanting zeal and Restoration corruption prevented the execution of this policy, realization by the clans that the Stuarts sincerely tried to benefit them called forth great efforts on behalf of the dethroned and exiled monarchs.

The exposition of this thesis is a long and complicated one. Miss Cunningham may be guilty of overemphasis in order to make her case quite clear, but she is her own best critic. She sets forth at great length the complications that arise, such as the religious question, the insufficient economic resources of the highlands, the need for military police, and the corrupt politics of the times. One may wish that she had spent more time on a description of the constitutional and administrative aspects of the Scottish government, particularly in the later period. All these factors and many others are interwoven with the feudal-patriarchal fabric of clan organization and have their bearing upon the causes for highland loyalty. Miss Cunningham has established her thesis and in the process has accounted for all these contributing elements. Her frequent and succinct statements of her theme may give one the impression of oversimplification, but review of the argument remedies that impression.

The book is written from a point of view quite in sympathy with the clans, although the author never fails to recognize their shortcomings or to estimate fairly the arguments on behalf of the opposing forces. The discussion of the Covenants and the period of the civil wars is one of the most brilliant sections of the work.

Bryn Mawr College. HELEN J. STAFFORD.

Fonctionnaires maritimes et coloniaux sous Louis XIV: Les Bégon. Par YVONNE BEZARD. (Paris: Albin Michel. 1932. Pp. 330. 20 fr.)

YVONNE BEZARD's competence as a scholar of the Ancien Régime had been previously indicated by a half dozen books dealing with rural and court life and the correspondence of aristocrats. The present volume deals with members of the Bégon family who played more or less significant rôles in French domestic, maritime, and colonial administration from the mid-seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries. It is a scholarly and clear narrative and a more comprehensive survey of the Bégons than appeared in fragmentary treatments by La Morinerie in 1855 and by Duplessis in 1896. The principal sources for the work are the manuscripts in the archives of the Chateaux de Gemeaux, the archives of the Marine and the Colonies, the maritime archives of Rochefort, and manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale.

The Bégons, a family of means and position established at Blois, were known for justice and fair dealing. They were related by marriage to Colbert

who recognized their talents and employed them in the service of the state. Michel Bégon, the chief figure of the book, was sent by Colbert in 1677 as assistant to the treasurer of the navy to serve at Toulon, later at Brest and Le Havre. He was an excellent financier and dealt wisely with sailors and their families. In 1682 he became intendant of the French West Indies and was stationed at Martinique until 1685. He sought the diversification of the agricultural pursuits of the islands and the immigration of whites and Negroes. He struggled for justice and an effective police and for moral improvement and education through the clergy—particularly the Jesuits and Ursulines. He opposed the expulsion of the Jews in 1683 but his liberalism was defeated by the influence of Jesuits.

In 1685 Bégon was recalled to be intendant of the galleys at Marseilles where he superintended the construction, equipment, and provisioning of about thirty galleys and had charge of the convicts' jail. He helped originate the policy of sending released criminals to the colonies. For unrepentant Huguenots who filled the galleys after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes he did what he could, though they added greatly to his problems.

Bégon was intendant at Rochefort from 1688 to 1694, and his authority extended to La Rochelle and the region of Aunis and Saintonge. Here he devoted himself to making available the naval resources of the region, promoting trade to the colonies, encouraging refineries, foundries, linen manufacture, street paving, water supply, health reforms, poor relief, education, and a building program. The reconstruction of Rochefort was the most tangible monument to Bégon's energy. He struggled to rectify the administration of police and ecclesiastical affairs. As a Catholic Bégon believed that repression of heresy was justifiable to a certain point but he disapproved of dragonnades, torture, and forced abjurations. He regarded conciliation and the return of the Huguenots as imperative for the economic welfare of France.

From the perplexities of administration Bégon, as a child of the Renaissance, found refuge in a library rich in theology, history, science, and literature. He compiled, with the aid of Charles Perrault, a collection of sketches of three hundred illustrious men who appeared in France in the seventeenth century. A chapter is devoted by Bezard to his domestic life, and two chapters narrate briefly the careers of his two brothers, François and Michel the Younger, and of his three sons and of one grandson. The oldest son, Michel, became intendant of Canada in 1712; the second son became bishop of Toul in 1721; the youngest son was royal lieutenant at Three Rivers, Canada, in 1731 and at Montreal in 1733. He was governor of Three Rivers from 1743 to his death in 1748. The last Bégon mentioned was Michel, intendant of Dunkirk in 1756. A generation before the Revolution the family betrayed signs of decay and died with the régime which it had served.

Pomona College. FRANK W. PITMAN.

The Rise of the British Coal Industry. In two volumes. By J. U. Nef, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Economics, University of Chicago. [Studies in Economic and Social History, London School of Economics.] (London: George Routledge and Sons; Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1932. Pp. xiv, 448; vii, 490; 14 maps and plates. $15.00.)

This study of the earlier history of the coal industry throws new light upon the history of the industry itself and adds new weight to claims that have latterly been urged for a revaluation of the economic development of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries. This period so long subordinated to the period of the "Industrial Revolution" must now be recognized explicitly as the beginning of the rise of modern industry. The work of Sombart emphasized the importance of the institutional development of the early modern period, but those who were disposed to focus attention on 1750 as a primary date line were able to allege that the great quantitative changes did not begin until the late eighteenth century. The quantitative material available for the history of commerce left it possible for the Hammonds to set up a distinction between the revolution in industry and the earlier revolution in commerce.

Professor Nef's study disposes decisively of this notion that the industrial changes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were confined to forms and possessed no large quantitative significance. Extensive research has made it possible to present an approximate summation of coal production at critical dates throughout the period. From an average annual product of 210,000 tons in the decade 1551–1560, production in Great Britain rose to 2,982,000 tons in the decade 1681–1690, to 10,295,000 tons in the decade 1781–1790, and 241,910,000 tons in the decade 1901–1910. These figures indicate an average rate of annual increase of a little more than two per cent. for the period 1551 to 1681, and a rate of a little less than 2.75 per cent. in the period 1781 to 1910. The expansion of the industry was, however, sharply checked by the Civil War, and we have figures for important coal fields for the decade 1631–1640 which show rates of increase of 3.75 and four per cent. These rates can scarcely have been exceeded in the periods of most rapid advance in the nineteenth century, and it is thus clear that the actual rates of expansion were closely comparable in these two periods, though the absolute quantities have, of course, become much more imposing in the latter period.

The increased coal consumption in the sixteenth century was due to wide substitution of coal and coke for wood and charcoal both as domestic and as industrial fuel. Salt works, glass making, potteries, and the metal trades were stimulated by the use of the new fuel and gave new direction to Britain's industrial effort. Shipbuilding received important stimulus from the demand for tonnage in the coastwise and foreign coal trades. It is thus dangerous to

allow the history of the textile trades to dominate our attention, though they remained the largest single industrial group until the nineteenth century. The new industries, too, disclose tendencies toward modern forms of organization and a concentration of capital not to be found at that date in the textile trades. Extensive revision of many old generalizations will thus be necessary if the actual significance of this new contribution is given its true value.

The importance of the contribution of the study to the broader aspects of the economic history of Great Britain should not be allowed to distract attention from the more immediate features of the work. The general historian will be especially interested in the discussion of the influence of the Reformation settlement on the mining properties in the hands of the Church; in the discussion of the legal aspects of mining rights and the building up of private rights to underground coal deposits. The mining interests were deeply involved in most of the major constitutional issues of the seventeenth century. Some monopolistic privileges were conferred upon various groups of producers and shippers in order to secure emergency revenue independently of Parliament. The importance of the Newcastle trade, too, made it a strategic point of attack. Both Parliamentarian forces and the Dutch were aware of the opportunity offered by this much exposed trade to put pressure on the loyalty and welfare of London and its vicinity. As Scotland is included in the study, there are many side lights upon the relations between England and Scotland during the period. It will be readily apparent, even without discussion of matters of primary interest to economists, that Professor Nef's study is one of the most important contributions to the economic history of Great Britain that has appeared for many years.

Harvard University. ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

Le Jansénisme durant la Régence. Tomes II[1]., II[2]., *La politique anti-janséniste du Régent, 1718–1723.* Par J. CARREYRE, professeur au Séminaire Saint-Sulpice. [Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique.] (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue. 1932; 1933. Pp. 336; 416. 14 Belgas each.)

IN these two volumes, Professor Carreyre has brought his work to a close. The first volume, reviewed in this journal (XXXIV. 874), bore the subtitle *La politique janséniste du Régent,* and ended with the royal declaration of October 7, 1717, imposing silence on both the partisans and the adversaries of the bull *Unigenitus.* It was the beginning of the anti-Jansenist policy of the regent, which, as the volumes under discussion show, was no more successful than the earlier policy.

In 1718, Languet de Gergy, bishop of Soissons, published his three *Avertissements.* By these writings, analyzed in volume II., chapter III., Languet placed himself at the head of the opponents of Jansenism. To those interested in theological controversy, the discussion of these pamphlets, as

well as the bishop's *Instructions pastorales*, particularly the fifth, analyzed in volume II[2]., chapters VII. and VIII., will make good reading. In fact, Languet is the central figure in M. Carreyre's scholarly work, not only because of the bishop's own writings, but because he preserved the correspondence which came to him from most of the dioceses of France. This valuable collection in the library at Sens, which the author uses with great profit, deserves publication, at least in part.

The *Avertissements* raised a violent controversy, and again the regent intervened by issuing a royal decree on June 5, 1719, imposing silence on both sides for one year. The second decree had no better success than the first, and an earnest attempt was now made to draw up a formula which would satisfy both the opponents of the bull and the papacy. The "accommodement" of 1720 (unfortunately M. Carreyre does not discuss its contents) was doomed to failure. It was indeed accepted by more than one hundred of the French bishops, even by Noailles, and the parlement of Paris finally registered its unwilling approval; but peace in the Church was as far removed as ever, and polemical writings continued to be published. Meanwhile, the papacy steadily refused any "explications" of the bull. Of the proponents of this scheme of reconciliation only Dubois gained his end. After two years of intrigue, he received the cardinal's hat from the new pope, Innocent XIII., although M. Carreyre, despite the accusations of Saint-Simon and later writers, denies that there was any trafficking or simony in the conclave (II[2]. 126).

These scholarly and carefully documented volumes are primarily for the specialist, and emphasizing the orthodox doctrines, complement Préclin's study of eighteenth century Jansenism. However, in the concluding chapter, M. Carreyre gives an interesting summary of the wider implications of his subject. The political importance of Jansenism is clear; but few historians would agree that if there had not been the religious quarrels, there would probably not have been a French Revolution (II[2]. 390).

Princeton University. E. A. Beller.

Lord Jeffery Amherst, a Soldier of the King. By J. C. Long. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xxi, 373. $4.00.)

This book is based upon the fine collection of Amherst Papers opened to students some years since through the kindness of the present earl. Mr. Long has been through the voluminous W. O. 34 series in the Public Record Office and has made a typescript index for interested scholars. He has been privileged to use the private papers still in possession of the family. From these materials he has skimmed such cream as personal comments and striking phrases, gossipy news from Amherst's friends, his tender and charming letters to the young wife who scarcely survived her husband's long absence. The story follows closely this one set of documents; where they fail to provide

sufficient background, secondary works are utilized. Couched in brief, quick paragraphs, the narrative is graphic, readable, and impressionistic. Newcastle minces, Cumberland is fat, nearsighted, and slow-witted, Gage sluggish, Pownall a godsend in a cantankerous world; among them strides the tall, auburn-haired iron man, inexorably active, a manufacturer of victory. Amherst's character emerges somewhat less shadowy than before, but the interpretation is casual, obvious, at times idealized. The hero reads the *Spectator* and a French translation of Pope; there is a strain of romanticism in him; he looks forward to the life of a country gentleman; he is a soldier who brooks no disobedience; ignorant of politics and faction, hurt by the indifference of the court and ministry toward him, he stands on his honor; competent in command of the army during North's ministry, he saves England from revolution in the Lord George Gordon riots. Of Amherst as the product of his century, of the shades and nuances that make personality, the reader will find little that satisfies. As for his generalship, suspicions still remain that he was not a great soldier, but only a capable one with fortune on his side.

Whoever undertakes to write a biography of an army commander in America before the Revolution must attempt, at least, to lay straight three interrelated problems, each a story in itself, the military situation in America, the aims of the separate colonies, and the ministerial politics in England. Mr. Long has not read widely enough to make the attempt. Because Amherst once met a financial emergency by borrowing from the New York assembly, it is a hasty error to assume that one of his chief duties was raising money in the colonies (pp. 116, 229), that he financed his campaigns without a shilling from home (p. ix), or that various loans by the colonies depreciated their currency (p. 196). A brief examination of the treasury minutes or of the Declared Accounts in the Record Office would have corrected that notion. British regulars, provincials, and rangers are so indiscriminately lumped together that the careless reader might easily conclude that Wolfe took Quebec with American troops (p. 86 and index under provincials). Day's *Calendar of Sir William Johnson Manuscripts* and Pound's *Johnson of the Mohawks* are cited, but not the splendid complete edition of the *Papers*. In fact, the standard collections of colonial archives have not been cited nor apparently used, any more than the departmental records or the Chatham Papers in the Record Office. Though Mr. Long quotes Namier's careful analysis of the eighteenth century constitution with approval, he berates George III. in 1770, for ignoring "Constitutional tradition, which under the circumstances called for a change of Ministers" (p. 220). By some oversight the statement finds a place that George II. at his death in 1760, "had come to the throne forty-six years previously" (p. 144). Such errors, and there are others, suggest lacunæ in knowledge.

Yale University. S. M. Pargellis.

Lord Loudoun in North America, 1756–1758. By STANLEY MCCRORY PARGELLIS, M.A., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Yale University. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1933. Pp. vi, 399. $4.00.)

IT would be interesting if some one could devise a test whereby the historian could ascertain just how far Benjamin Franklin is responsible for the popular belief that certain British generals in the early part of the French and Indian War were a rather incompetent lot. It is apparent that the good Doctor was put out by the fact that many Pennsylvania farmers held him liable for their wagons which were lost in Braddock's campaign. It is also apparent that whatever the Doctor said on any subject *is* history. Professor Pargellis has given us a really satisfactory account of a British commander in chief in America, and since he has in his 399 pages failed to make any mention of Franklin's opinion of Lord Loudoun, the reviewer declines to repeat just what the Doctor thought of his lordship, and what has therefore served as so-called public opinion these hundred and fifty years.

When the late Mr. Henry E. Huntington brought to his library the British Headquarters archives of Loudoun's period of office, he offered American historians a first-rate opportunity to ascertain just why and how the British army functioned in America during the last colonial war. Mr. Pargellis seized the opportunity and has demonstrated to us the fact that while a British officer in America might be a pompous ass, nevertheless, it was possible for a colonial official to be equally as pompous and in some cases more asinine. The volume makes clear that the French and Indian War was not a conflict between a French army and a British army. There were three warring elements: the French army, the British trying to direct a mongrel army, and the colonial assemblies whose particularism would have tried the patience of a saint. This book is confined to the last two elements, and shows in satisfying detail just how mongrel was that Anglo-American army, wherein British and American units were brigaded together, and British regiments were permeated with American recruits. Colonial officials are seen behaving in a manner suggestive of the interchange of courtesies between modern governors of Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas on the limitations of output of cotton and oil. While on the whole Mr. Pargellis has drawn a sympathetic portrait of Loudoun, one feels that it is the inevitable result of living with a man's papers for an extended period. If, with the author's equipment and material, he cannot arouse more enthusiasm for his subject, possibly it cannot be done, and Loudoun should remain in American history a man who was given an impossible task, who lacked the brilliance to carry on, and who was wanting in the tact necessary to convince the Americans that they had originated his ideas.

Loudoun's one military exploit, that against Louisbourg, is characterized in one of Professor Pargellis's best paragraphs—the weather was a funda-

mental explanation of that failure. Less than ten per cent. of this book is devoted to military maneuvers. The remainder is an examination and description of the administration of the British army during the period of Loudoun's command. Every page seems to present a new and different explanation of British failure during the early years of the war, each well documented, so that one wonders what prevented the French from capturing Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. A point well deserving of the emphasis laid upon it by Professor Pargellis is the extent to which commanders in America were hampered by detailed instructions from home. This indicates a settled policy, the continuance of which during the Revolution became significant. The eternal righteousness of the elder Pitt suffers somewhat, and probably correctly.

Professor Pargellis has done so much that it would be captious to criticize him for not doing more—yet one cannot help feeling that his chapter XI., The Administration of the Army, ought to be made the subject of a separate and lengthy study. This cannot be done in any satisfactory fashion until we have been given equally good studies of Braddock, Abercromby, Gage, Clinton, and Carleton. J. C. Long's biography of Amherst is commented upon elsewhere in this *Review,* and a study of Howe is, we understand, in press. Future investigators will have to face the problem of whether to study these generals in a biographic fashion, as has Mr. Long, or whether to follow Mr. Pargellis's lead and study their administrative careers in America. Mr. Pargellis displays a fondness for long paragraphs and periodic sentences, but one who has been confronted by such a mass of manuscripts as constitute a collection like Mr. Huntington's Loudoun Papers, will view this possible objection rather tolerantly. The reader must understand that the quantity of evidence with which the author had to deal probably made him so cautious, that for his own protection he found it necessary to hedge every general statement with numerous qualifying clauses. While this sometimes makes hard reading, it does mark the author as a conscientious investigator.

The University of Michigan. RANDOLPH G. ADAMS.

A Guide to the Study of British Caribbean History, 1763–1834, including the Abolition and Emancipation Movements. Compiled by LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, George Washington University. [*Annual Report* of the American Historical Association, 1930, volume III.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1932. Pp. viii, 725. $1.50.)

THIS important volume is a sequel to Dr. Ragatz's *Fall of the Planter Class in the British Caribbean, 1763–1833,* awarded the Justin Winsor Prize in 1926 and published in 1928. It is the result of eleven years' labor and "is based on material in 69 repositories, both public and private, in seven countries". The author visited all of these institutions excepting the Institute

of Jamaica at Kingston whose catalogues have been scrupulously edited by Mr. Frank Cundall. With the exception of fourteen rare items abstracted for Dr. Ragatz by their custodians, every item listed has been personally examined and, in the great majority of cases, the authorship has been identified and the content of each work abstracted and critically evaluated. The index, compiled by Mrs. Mary Parker Ragatz, containing author, title, subject, and proper name entries, covers 142 pages and is a model index for such a guide.

Part I. lists bibliographies, catalogues, indexes, and guides, and Part II. includes annuals, handbooks, guidebooks, and reference works. Part III. is devoted to manuscripts located in twelve archives: the Boston Public Library, British Museum, Institute of Jamaica, Library of Congress, London Missionary Society, Merchants Hall of Bristol, Public Record Office, Royal Empire Society, University of London (typewritten theses), West India Committee (London), Worthy Park Plantation (Jamaica), and the grocery firm of Wilkinson and Gaviller of London. Some minor collections are noted. It should perhaps be stated that the Institute of Jamaica is accumulating a considerable number of manuscripts for this period, but the list of them awaits publication. Also the Yale University Library possesses a collection of some fifty mortgage deeds of West India estates for the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Possibly a number of private manuscript collections in Great Britain await discovery. For the Public Record Office manuscripts Dr. Ragatz had already published in more expanded form *A Guide to the Official Correspondence of the Governors of the British West India Colonies with the Secretary of State, 1763–1833* (London, 1923, 2d ed., 1929).

Printed public documents (Part IV.) are classified under Great Britain, United States, West Indies in general, each of fourteen British colonies, and the French Caribbean colonies. The documents contain laws and ordinances, separate acts, orders in council, proclamations and notices. Part V., devoted to legislative journals, debates, sessional papers, votes, etc., is similarly classified and represents an enormous task, for it devotes about sixty pages to definite citations to West India materials in bills, reports, accounts and papers ordered printed by the House of Commons and by the House of Lords. These citations are classified under such headings as commerce and industry, sugar, rum, slavery, maroons, individual colonies, etc. The same classes of materials, ordered printed by each colony, are also listed.

The remainder of the *Guide* (pp. 151–582) comprises the listing, abstracting, and critical appraisal of privately printed materials. The author's abstracts are excellent: they often identify the writer's background, the groups or schools of thought represented, peculiar merits or defects of the works, and citations, where possible, to reviews of the books. The section on Agriculture, Commerce, and Industry reveals the impact on the empire of the revolutions in agriculture, in industry, and in economic and social philosophy,

through which England was passing. The material reviewed testifies to an unprecedented intellectual ferment. Evangelical sects proclaimed some of the social implications of Christianity, blasted Anglicans out of inertia, and incurred the condemnation of planters who blamed missionaries for slave revolts. Caribbean literature was poor, though Monk Lewis, Mrs. Browning, and Charles Kingsley had financial contacts with the islands. The period saw the birth of tropical medicine. The legal treatises were utilitarian rather than philosophical. The West Indies loomed larger then than now in British and foreign periodicals. Dr. Ragatz characterizes the viewpoints of British reviews toward slavery and political economy. Newspapers were numerous and short lived; files are fragmentary, the best collection being in the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester. *The Gleaner and DeCordova's Advertising Sheet* "published . . . at least to 1901" (p. 394) has continued to the present, as *The Daily Gleaner,* Jamaica's leading paper. The largest section is devoted to the literature of abolition and emancipation. Of 167 pages in this part, sixty-seven list anonymous publications. The high quality of Dr. Ragatz's appraisals are sustained to the end. For this exceedingly valuable guide, characterized as it is by comprehensiveness, accuracy, discrimination, and critical judgment, the reviewer and all students of Caribbean history must feel a profound gratitude.

Pomona College. FRANK W. PITMAN.

Le Consulat et l'Empire. Par LOUIS MADELIN, de l'Académie française. Deux tomes. [L'histoire de France racontée à tous, publiée sous la direction de Fr. Funck-Brentano, membre de l'Institut.] (Paris: Librairie Hachette. 1932; 1933. Pp. 541; 454. 25 fr. each.)

MORE than a score of years have elapsed since M. Madelin wrote for the same series his much read volume, *La Révolution* (Paris, 1911). The publication of the two present volumes, which provide the sequel, complete this excellent national history of France. The principal characteristic which distinguishes the work from a biography of Napoleon and which thus warrants its place in the series is the study of the movement of opinion. From Brumaire until the Abdication, "A la vérité, la masse du peuple—paysans, ouvriers, petits bourgeois—restait, elle, fidèle sans réserves à Napoléon" (II. 237). Though, on this solid support, the Little Corporal established and maintained his power, the political, business, and intellectual classes, and the leaders of church and society were extremely susceptible to the effects of every action, event, or change of policy in administration, diplomacy, or war. They applauded, chattered, grumbled, sulked, intrigued, or revolted as occasion and self-interest seemed to suggest. These shifting currents and the incessant plots are suitably evaluated and integrated into the narrative of familiar events. This is a valuable aid to understanding the life of the time, but the revelation of French character—or is it human nature?—is far from edifying.

There is a choice collection of traitors, Pichegru, Bernadotte, Marmont, Murat, and, prince of all, Talleyrand with his incredible duplicities at Erfurt and his amazing effrontery at all times. There is the dextrous—frequently ambidextrous—Fouché posing as the savior of the Revolution from royalist reaction. There are Moreau, "l'homme des retraites" (I. 96); the impressionable Caulaincourt, the would-be "European"; and a host of other misguided souls. The Bonaparte family, however, holds the unenviable primacy for variegated and insensate perversity, and at its head was Joseph, the prince of ineptitude. These only suggest the innumerable exasperating interests that Napoleon had to conciliate or combat in order to give France the best government it ever enjoyed (*cf.* I. 57, 214, 271; II. 122) and to exalt its glories to their zenith.

Madelin is a frank and devoted admirer of Napoleon as an individual, a general, and a statesman. He extols his extraordinary intellectual gifts, his prodigious capacity for work, his peculiar power of imposing his personality upon those about him, his infinite care to inform himself on the problems ahead, his accurate intuitions, and his rare discrimination. He wisely takes pains to point out the critical occasions when Napoleon's information was inadequate. He admits that Napoleon did not know his Spain properly, that he never understood the Spanish character, and that, after 1809, he gave up in disgust the task of repairing those deficiencies and contented himself with superficial reports. Perhaps the most serious weakness of his character was his impatient disgust with those affairs in which he encountered ill-fortune—he knew that nothing in his career was so ill-fated as the Spanish blunder and rightly he loathed Spain.

Napoleon's basic policy, Madelin insists, was to rid France of factions and parties, to secure the reconciliation and union of all citizens, and to blend into a new governmental system the virtues of both the Old Régime and the Revolution. Political rather than military affairs were his preferred field of action, and economic interests appealed to him more than either. Agriculture and industry he delighted to encourage, but commerce concerned him less, and the so-called financial classes were to him an abomination. From first to last, his fixed policy was to obtain a settled peace—war diverted him from his prime interests in government and national welfare. Others, England, Austria, Prussia, Russia, were in each case directly and criminally responsible for the renewal and continuation of the wars. On them Madelin fastens the blame for the failures of negotiations in 1813 and 1814.

Except where the English are concerned, the accounts of military events are more satisfactory than the usually fuller treatment of diplomatic affairs, for the international picture is never in focus for anyone but the Parisian observer. For the English in general and for Pitt and his disciples in particular Madelin has the coldest scorn. He is just to Fox and grudgingly admits that Wellington won some successes, yet it is not in what is said about

the English but in the deliberate omissions of pertinent facts that the author is guilty of his principal dereliction. In the words of Napoleon, Prussian policy was "fausse et bête" (I. 282). Russia and Alexander as well seem to have an intriguing interest for the author. Following Vandal and Sorel, he portrays the czar as "un Grec de Byzance", notably in two brilliant paragraphs *à propos* of Tilsit (I. 327–328). Austria wins cool admiration and so does Metternich who plays his hand with relentless skill unhampered by honesty.

With far calmer judgment, the author devotes some of his best sections to religious affairs and the relations with the papacy. Pius VII. is admirably depicted as a good but not a great man unhappily thrust between the *Curia* and Napoleon. Nowhere does the latter appear less advantageously than in his dealings with the pope, and yet Madelin treats him with amazing leniency (I. 224, 229; II. 8). Here, as in almost every blunder or mishap, political, diplomatic, or military, some underling is discovered to be the emperor's scapegoat or evil genius. Besides the quarrel with the pope, Napoleon's fatal blunders were the Continental Blockade and the consequent Spanish intervention, but each was inevitable. The divorce was a political necessity but ill-omened. So, too, was the Austrian marriage which resulted in accentuating traits of weakness and imperiousness which were already manifesting themselves in the emperor's character and policies. Contrary to Driault, Madelin has little sympathy for the Grand Empire, the United States of Europe, the new Charlemagne, and the Empire of the Occident. Then, as now, these were false trails, which led beyond the bounds of realistic national interest; they were, and are, European, not French. The author has not escaped the infection of current fascism and national chauvinism.

Despite all criticism, Madelin has produced a work of solid merits which has few equals among the accounts of the Napoleonic period. His effort to attain comprehensiveness in treatment has imposed such succinctness that the style is less felicitous than in *La Révolution*. Aside from printed works in French, the author claims to have used some documents of which identification is withheld. The bibliographical notes at the ends of chapters are avowedly incomplete but they are also in such attenuated form as to be almost useless. Admitting that a French scholar is writing for French readers, he may be pardoned for citing French works by preference and for utilizing, to a large degree, materials most edifying to Gallic taste. As a scholar, however, it is fair to expect of him adequate consideration of the researches of scholars in other lands. There is no hint that he is cognizant of the contributions of Beer, Angeli, Zeissberg, and other Austrians. Apparently, so far as he is concerned, Napier and Oman might as well never have written of the Peninsular War, Mahan need never have expounded the significance of sea power, and Henry Adams might have saved himself the task of disentangling so many threads of Napoleonic diplomacy. Perhaps all this will be hand-

somely redressed when M. Madelin fulfills his promise to provide a more complete work on the period and a fuller bibliography. Then, too, may the suggestion be pardoned that no book is a good book if it lacks a good index.

Wesleyan University. GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

L'idée nationale autrichienne et les guerres de Napoléon: L'apostolat du Baron de Hormayr et le salon de Caroline Pichler. Par ANDRÉ ROBERT, docteur ès lettres, professeur à l'Institut français de Vienne. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1933. Pp. xix, 603. 80 fr.)

IN 1930 appeared Dr. Langsam's *The Napoleonic Wars and German Nationalism in Austria.* His study attempted to establish the thesis that the wars of Napoleon stimulated among the Austrian Germans a feeling of "common peopleness" with other Germans. In spite of a marked similarity of title the work under review is not devoted to the same subject but to a discussion of a rival idea, the union of the peoples of the Austrian Empire under the rule of the Hapsburgs. As its rather lengthy title indicates it traces the growth of what contemporaries rather confusingly called the Austrian national idea, the effect of the Napoleonic wars on the Austrian monarchy, the apostolate of Baron von Hormayr, the prophet of the Austrian idea, and the relation of Caroline Pichler to the movement.

The Austrian idea grew slowly. The name Austria first appears in a document of 996. The election of Rudolph of Hapsburg as emperor in 1273 linked Austria with its future ruling family. The battle of Mohács in 1526 opened the way for the union of Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary. The work of the Jesuits saved the emerging state from Protestantism. The Pragmatic Sanction of 1713 consecrated the Austrian idea. The reign of Maria Theresa consolidated it. For a time in the eighteenth century the policies of Joseph II. threatened its normal development. The wars of Napoleon menaced it with complete destruction.

The attention of the reader is mainly directed to the part played in the latter stirring events by Baron von Hormayr. In association with Archduke John this Austrian patriot constituted the soul of the opposition to Napoleon in his native province of Tyrol in 1805 and the center of the Tyrolean rising against Bavaria in 1809. This study is devoted particularly, however, to the influence of Baron von Hormayr upon the intellectual, literary, and artistic life of his country. Fired by the example of Johann von Müller, the Swiss historian, he made himself the prophet of the idea that the writers, artists, and musicians of Austria should place themselves at the service of the state and the dynasty. Believing that they should draw their inspiration mainly from history he edited and published a mass of books, pamphlets, and journals that set forth in patriotic fashion the achievements of the Hapsburg dynasty and its servants. He owed much of his influence to the salon maintained by Caroline Pichler, the first person to open such an institution at

Vienna. Through this means he established between 1805 and 1809 his spiritual supremacy over Caroline Pichler herself, the Collin brothers, and other literary figures, and over a number of artists and musicians. He never succeeded in imposing his ideas on Grillparzer.

The propaganda of Baron von Hormayr owed its temporary success and ultimate downfall to reasons of state. In 1805 and 1806 the course of events in Germany struck from the trembling hands of the Hapsburgs the scepter of Charlemagne and directed their attention to the Austrian idea. They found an apostle in the vain, able, ambitious director of the state archives. After 1809 Baron von Hormayr unfortunately failed to recognize that the situation had changed and that the preservation of the dynasty was more important for the time being than the recovery of Tyrol. His stubborn blindness finally led to his arrest and incarceration and the destruction of his movement.

The work of Professor Robert constitutes an able and interesting study of two minor and rather neglected personalities of the Napoleonic period. The book reveals a mastery of the literature of the subject, historical perspective, and fine powers of analysis and characterization. The reader, however, will close the book with more or less doubt as to the relative importance of the movement so admirably portrayed.

The University of Wisconsin. C. P. Higby.

The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Victorian Age. A Series of Lectures delivered at King's College, University of London, during the Session 1931–1932. Edited by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of King's College and Professor of Mediæval History in the University of London. (London: George G. Harrap. 1933. Pp. 271. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

I can easily recall the time when English historians declined to know anything that had happened since 1713, or at latest 1815; a time, in any case, when they looked askance at those who rashly ventured to drag "Thinkers" on to the historical cricket field. Yet now, in this time of slipping foundations, the professor of Medieval history at King's College has somehow managed to unite a happy family of professors of history, politics, law, education, and I don't know what else, in the novel task of surveying "the whole process of European thought from St. Augustine to Matthew Arnold". Nor is this all. The editor has himself ventured to write (most competently too—that's the worst of it) on thinkers as far afield from his own bailliwick as Rousseau and Herbert Spencer. So enterprising an editor may yet (I don't put it past him) provide us with a ninth volume surveying the process of European thought from Matthew Arnold to Hitler. Is it possible that the English are not, as we have been led to suppose, incurably conservative and insular? I've often suspected as much, but it's a disturbing thought all the same.

Those who are unduly apprehensive may take courage from the fact that the present volume exhibits some traces of the old insularity, and some examples of the good old British penchant for anomalies. For example, the phrase "Victorian Age" in the title of a book supposed to survey the process of European thought! Even if the survey were confined to the process of English thought, one hardly thinks of Thinkers in juxtaposition to the good queen. Again, although the book does not neglect Continental thought, Professor Gooch's introductory essay, admirable as an analysis of the main trend of British thought in the nineteenth century, leaves something to be desired as an introduction to nineteenth century European thought as a whole. The book is in fact more hospitable to Continental thinkers than the introduction, since it includes Tocqueville, Taine, and Marx (all of whom, especially Marx, look a bit odd bracketed under the "Victorian Age"). And yet, while Marx is included, J. S. Mill is not, having been treated in the preceding volume. There were no doubt good reasons for that; but since Mill and Marx were the outstanding exponents of the two outstanding and contrasted systems of political ideology of the century, what one misses most in this volume is a critical exposition of Mill's Liberalism to serve as a background for J. L. Gray's most admirable exposition of Marx's Socialism.

However, the book is excellent as it is—it maintains the high level of the previous volumes. Naturally, some of the essays are less good than others. Professor Montmorency's essay on Sir Henry Maine is a work of piety rather than of criticism. The author admits that he approaches his task "as an advocate, and not with a purely judicial mind". That he is a loving disciple of Maine need not have been a serious disadvantage, or any disadvantage at all. What deprives his essay of critical value is his lack of objectivity toward his own method of approach to juristic problems. He reads the analytical jurists "with respect" (an irrelevant attitude in any critic), but obviously regards them as engaged in a futile quest since they "disagree to an extent and with a violence that I should not have thought possible had I not studied the history of philosophy". A study of the history of philosophy has apparently brought Professor Montmorency no further than to the profound conviction that the historical jurists alone have hit upon the right method of discovering the Truth. "The historical jurist is not troubled in this way [in the way that the analytical jurists are]. He sees the vision of Truth shining before him, and his task—a fearful one, no doubt—is to find the right path through the prickly gorse", etc., etc., "and to approach with reverence the one and indivisible altar where Truth dwells." *Naïveté,* carried to this pitch, becomes even interesting—a psychological problem; but it does nothing to increase our understanding of Sir Henry Maine, or of the historical approach to jurisprudence. A historian should learn, more readily than anyone it seems, that the historical approach, like any other, is historically conditioned—that, as J. B. Bury said, the function of history is not to solve problems but to trans-

form them. The other writers are all more aware that their writing is based on preconceptions; and their essays are all excellent, the most critically competent being those on Herbert Spencer by the editor of the series, on Tocqueville by H. J. Laski, and on Marx by J. L. Gray. Professor Hearnshaw has exhibited most vividly the amusing spectacle of Spencer alternately engaged in refuting his theory of the social organism by his theory of political individualism, and his theory of poltical individualsm by his theory of the social organism. Those who think of Tocqueville as an admirer of democracy because he approved of the checks which the American Constitution placed on democracy should read Professor Laski's informed and judicious estimate of this too much neglected writer. And those who are interested in Marx, especially the pseudo-Marxians and those who refute Marx by refusing to read him, cannot afford to neglect Professor Gray's really discriminating analysis of the "most subversive force in the modern world".

I do really hope that Professor Hearnshaw will give us that ninth volume surveying the process of European thought from Matthew Arnold to Hitler. I should like to know what to think about Mussolini.

Cornell University. CARL BECKER.

Documents diplomatiques français, 1871–1914. Série 1 (1871–1900), tome V., *23 février, 1883–9 avril, 1885.* [Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Commission de publication des documents relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1933. Pp. xxxvii, 690. 60 fr.)

EXCEPT for the considerable number of documents relating to Tonkin in the *Livres Jaunes* and the four (nos. 385, 407, 475, 530) of a more general interest, extracts from which appear in Bourgeois, Pagès, *Les origines et les responsabilités de la grande guerre* (Paris, 1922), this volume contains a wealth of hitherto unpublished material for France's foreign policy during Ferry's second and last ministry. To documents from the official archives have been added letters and notes, especially Ferry's, from private collections. The minister's point of view is here more adequately presented than in the earlier volumes of this series, although one seeks in vain for Ferry's reaction to Bismarck's suggestion of a personal meeting (no. 530). It is possible now to speak with more certainty of France's attitude during the period of closest Franco-German coöperation, and of the French understanding of Bismarck's policy.

Never was that coöperation to Ferry and Courcel more than one for the attainment of specific colonial interests (no. 385). Bismarck's support was most appreciated in matters of relatively minor significance as in Madagascar (nos. 23, 29), and in the withdrawal of the consular courts in Tunis (no. 90), whereas Ferry definitely rejected his offer to mediate the Franco-Chinese quarrel over Tonkin because of its probable effect upon French public opin-

ion (no. 397). Only after the French defeat at Lang-Son, and on the eve of his repudiation by the chamber, did he suggest that Bismarck might speak a word to China (no. 638). For his reserve during the negotiations leading to the Berlin Conference, November, 1884, a partial explanation may be found in the failure of the London Conference, July, 1884, to solve the Egyptian question in France's interest (no. 369). The repeated disavowals of Münster's part in that failure (nos. 342, 349, 354, 391, 399, 405) never quite allayed France's suspicions. Like Bismarck, the French were ready to negotiate, as on the eve of the two conferences, for a separate arrangement with England, with the same crop of suspicions in Germany that France felt in regard to Anglo-German negotiations (nos. 268, 346, 450, 483). In reply to Bismarck's talk of a league of neutrals against England, Ferry insisted that the Berlin Conference should not resolve itself into a specifically anti-English combination (nos. 372, 446), and that France should cautiously act *with* the Continental powers, not as their leader, in checking England's ambitions in Egypt (no. 239).

As to his more intimate thought in regard to a Franco-German understanding, Ferry's letters and memoranda are silent; it is, however, significant that he suggested a commercial treaty for the revision of Article XI. of the Treaty of Frankfort (nos. 376, 381), an idea to which Bismarck returned an evasive reply (no. 385). The same reticence did not distinguish Courcel at Berlin, for he wrote of Germany's friendship as "une amitié orageuse" (no. 500) and of her relations with friends and opponents alike as "le marchandage continuel" (no. 622). That he was excessively suspicious of Bismarck's intentions is well known, but some of his observations of the German scene are noteworthy. He was doubtless justified in drawing the attention of his government to the contrast between Germany's official friendliness and the frequent encouragement of the anti-French tendencies of public opinion (no. 3).

Duke University. E. Malcolm Carroll.

The Life of Joseph Chamberlain. By J. L. Garvin. Volume II., 1885-1895. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. 644. $5.00.)

Mr. Garvin continues his biography at a leisurely rate, but there is nothing leisurely about the tempo of his writing. Gladstone's Thunderbolt, His Life in his Hands, The Fight to the Death—these are among the chapter headings under which the author dramatizes the great Liberal schism. Macaulay never wrote in more sparkling vein about his seven bishops. In this drama Gladstone, aged and inscrutable, plays the part of Merlin, while Chamberlain, the wary and indomitable knight, slays the dragon, Home Rule.

In this long and intimate analysis of antagonistic ideas and clashing

personalities Mr. Garvin is warmly partisan. This does not mean, however, that the author is writing a panegyric in hundreds of pages. Rather he is describing a Homeric contest in a Homeric way—all the contestants are drawn in heroic form, Dilke, Morley, Lord Randolph Churchill, Gladstone.

"I say that the time has come to reform altogether the absurd and irritating anachronism known as Dublin Castle." Thus Chamberlain spoke in 1885. Within a year he was to wreck Home Rule, to ruin the Liberal party, and to make havoc of his own radical program for the betterment of England. How did this come about?

Mr. Garvin lays the onus on Gladstone for yielding to Parnell, and to a certain extent the author is justified in so doing. Gladstone was aging fast and out of touch with the new spirit of the Liberal party. His mind was set on freedom in the old sense of *laissez faire*—both economic and political. But the fault lay also to a greater extent than Mr. Garvin will admit with Gladstone's intractable lieutenant. Chamberlain had been slighted by Gladstone, had been rebuffed by Parnell, and had been petted in the constituencies. His mind was engrossed with his "unauthorized program" and the new liberalism. Had he been somewhat more patient it is well within the bounds of possibility that he might have succeeded to the leadership of a well-nigh united Liberal party.

After all, the divergences between Gladstone's idea of Home Rule and Chamberlain's scheme for national councils for Ireland were not so extreme. The gap might have been bridged had there been less jealousy and personal friction on either side, a somewhat greater spirit of accommodation, and a little more time for hot-heads to grow cool.

The second half of this book traces Chamberlain's career from 1886 to his entry into Lord Salisbury's cabinet. The breach between Chamberlain and the Gladstonians now became permanent. The Round Table Conference proved futile. Chamberlain "ingeminated peace and desired it, yet with innate tenacity he wanted his own way". In this excellent statement Mr. Garvin summarizes the issue.

The majority of the Liberals followed Gladstone; the rump, Chamberlain. The latter, the Liberal Unionists, were successful in defeating Home Rule in 1893, but in very little else. Chamberlain, however, was a man apart. As *The Times* stated of him: "his influence accumulates although his party decays". The extraordinary force of the man, his iron will, his honesty, his loyal coöperation and political abilities increased his standing with his Tory allies. Chamberlain gradually swung toward their side, moderating although not surrendering his radical program. He squeezed a part of it, at any rate, out of the Tories—free education, local government in the counties, and a partial step toward peasant proprietorship. Also to his everlasting credit should be ascribed his determined advocacy of old age pensions, a proposal so radical as to seem bizarre to Morley and to Gladstone.

Mr. Garvin shows the defects of his own qualities. It is almost impossible to write with the violence of Burke and remain impartial. It is unfair, I think, for the author to laud the radicalism of Chamberlain and in the same book to denounce the Newcastle Program of the Gladstonians. It is unnecessarily rhetorical to write of Chamberlain's conduct in the matter of Dilke's divorce as "nothing less than heroic through an ordeal as dreadful of its kind as any episode in political history". Chamberlain was loyal to Dilke, his friend; but so were many others. Why should they not have been? Why these extreme encomiums?

The above, however, are but incidental flaws in what is a magnificent book. That Mr. Garvin cannot make Joseph Chamberlain altogether attractive is not his fault. Always and ever there is the trace of something lacking in Chamberlain's personality. In one sentence Mr. Garvin tells us what it is. "In practical imagination—that is in the architectural sense applied to politics—he excelled. But, to interpret spiritual imagination he had no faculty."

Princeton University. WALTER PHELPS HALL.

Souvenirs de Charles Benoist, membre de l'Institut, ancien député de Paris, ancien ministre de France à la Haye. Deux tomes, *1882–1902.* (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1932; 1933. Pp. xv, 367; 464. 36 fr. each.)

MEMBER of the Institute, former deputy, former minister of France to The Hague, lecturer at the École des Sciences politiques, these titles alone would justify the prediction that Monsieur Benoist's recollections would be of interest. One other aspect of his career, however, has contributed an even greater importance to his work: for years he was political observer at large for the *Temps,* that most admirable of Paris papers, and, in 1894, he was called by Brunetière to perform the same function for the *Revue des Deux Mondes.* The contacts literary, political, and social that he established during these important years make the two volumes pleasant if rather long reading.

In France, in Rome, and in Berlin, between 1883 and 1893, Benoist moved in literary and political circles. At home he observed Fustel de Coulanges, Renan, all the great galaxy of late nineteenth century scholarship, and at Rome he watched with interest and reported on the actions and plans of Leo XIII. and of Crispi. In Berlin, Bismarck and his radical opponents afforded him cause for study and reflection.

Benoist's first ten years of experience as an observer and his habit of study in the works of the early political writers made him less of an actor and more of a philosopher. He had witnessed the rise of an organized radicalism, the unraveling of the tangled problems of church and state, and the conflict between a newly established empire and a dawning liberalism. These experiences gave him a new purpose; he would pursue the study of what he chose to call "La crise de l'État moderne" which, to his way of thinking, was to be

found in three new movements, the organization of universal suffrage, the organization of a new democracy, and the organization of labor. When, therefore, in 1894, Brunetière called him to become observer and reporter for the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* his interests took a definite direction; he began to test the strength and potentialities of the new régimes and the old. His first journey took him to Holland where he studied the critical situation attendant to the enthronement of Queen Wilhemina. From Holland he moved to Spain where the intimate contacts that he formed afforded him the opportunity of examining at close hand the condition of the old monarchy just at the moment of the Cuban and Philippine insurrections. In 1897 he went to Austria. At Vienna, at Budapest, and at Prague, he met with conservative and liberal, and, in the pages of the *Revue,* foretold the dissolution of the Dual Monarchy and the revival of a nation.

From these nineteen years of experience Benoist emerged with a political philosophy quite different from that of the majority of his generation. Observation and study particularly of the works of Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and Giannotti had, by 1902, made of him a monarchist.

These two volumes are interesting as the story of the growth of a political idea, but they have, as well, another value. They are replete with personal conversations between Benoist and many of the principals in the political drama that was being enacted between 1883 and 1902. There are occasional pen portraits that are clear, succinct, and amusing. Benoist is a delightful *raconteur.*

The second volume concludes with the year 1902. This year Benoist regards as marking the end of his political schooling; at this point his political life began. As he states in his preface, the first two volumes reveal M. Benoist *en philosophe.* The third volume, which will shortly appear, will reveal M. Benoist in public life.

Yale University. JOHN M. S. ALLISON.

De Bismarck à Poincaré: Soixante ans de diplomatie républicaine. Par RAYMOND RECOULY. (Paris: Les Editions de France. 1932. Pp. viii, 543. 30 fr.)

THIS is not a manual on foreign affairs but a brilliantly written survey of European foreign relations as seen by an able French journalist. How the Third Republic lifted France from defeat and isolation to leadership in the greatest alliance known to history; carried her through to victory in the World War, and to the hegemony of post-war Europe, while at the same time building a world empire, second only to that of Britain, is told with great verve and enthusiasm. That this achievement was accomplished amid a bewildering change of ministers whose average life was about eighteen months, was not only paradoxical but well-nigh miraculous—*un paradoxe, un miracle.*

The explanation, according to the author, is found in the acceptance by the French that foreign affairs must not be subjected to the rivalries and personal disputes of domestic politics. A very large measure of independence in direction and control is vested in the minister of foreign affairs, and the more or less permanent officials of the foreign office. As a result, certain outstanding foreign ministers, like Delcassé and Briand, held office through successive changes of ministries, and career men in the diplomatic service, like Paul Cambon and Camille Barrère, who occupied the important posts in London and Rome without interruption for a quarter of a century, carried on despite the frequent changes in government. On the staff of the foreign office itself, Philippe Berthelot served for more than twenty years as political director, while Paléologue and others remained almost as continuously in their divisions. The result was a unity of purpose and consciousness of objectives in the conduct of the foreign policy of the Third Republic totally lacking in Germany, for example, after Bismarck.

Curiously enough, Poincaré is given very little credit for his share in this development, despite the fact that his name appears so prominently in the title. True, this is in accord with the thesis of Poincaré's own *Memoirs,* in which he claims that when he left the foreign office for the presidency, his influence in foreign affairs greatly declined. Students of pre-war diplomacy, however, are inclined to the view that as chief executive of the Republic, Poincaré continued to play a dominant rôle in French foreign affairs. Why hesitate to acknowledge those *carrefours,* to use the author's own expression, which Poincaré himself laid down, and which more than anything else determined the direction of Franco-Russian policy in the Balkans? They were of first-rate importance.

Certain moot questions usually regarded as vital to a correct understanding of pre-war diplomacy are either not mentioned or brushed aside as of little consequence. Some of these, adequately treated, might put the author's thesis in quite a different light. Thus, nothing is said of the significance of Delcassé's triumph during his 1899 visit to St. Petersburg in securing the czar's consent to an extension of the Franco-Russian alliance by which the *casus fœderis* was thenceforward to apply not merely if peace were disturbed, but equally against the disturbance of the balance of power. Similarly, French assurances of support to Russia in regard to the Balkan qu tion which Isvolsky reported to Sazonov in 1912, the bribery of a number of important French journals for the development of public opinion in France favorable to the support of Russian aims in the Balkans, and the confidence France already had of English aid, military as well as naval, in case of a war with Germany, are likewise suppressed or slighted. The author treats Poincaré's visit to Russia in July, 1914, mainly from the standpoint of its having delayed the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, and, because of the absence of both Poincaré and Viviani from Paris, of its having crippled the pacific (*sic*) activities of the French government.

Plainly, the student interested in getting at the real history of European

international relations for this critical period, or the facts as to the much discussed responsibility for the war, will not find particularly valuable material here. In view of the unprecedented and now almost complete publication of historical materials from the archives on the policies of the powers before the World War, the continuance of outworn methods of historical writing in so important a field is regrettable. To dismiss as "pro-German propaganda" the work of historians whose researches lead them to reject the thesis that one power was obviously pacific and that the war was caused solely by German *politique brutale* following the course laid down by Bismarck, makes rather excessive demands upon the credulity of even those who are inclined to accept the author's main thesis.

The University of Pennsylvania. WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

An Economic History of Soviet Russia. By LANCELOT LAWTON. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. ix, viii, 629. $6.50.)

THE author, who wrote this work with the assistance of his Russian wife and a translator, devotes five chapters to the economic history of Russia to 1917 and forty-eight to the period after that to 1932. His objective is a general work for the layman unencumbered by the technical language of economic theory or by lengthy references either to sources or secondary works. This does not mean that its value is vitiated for scholars, but rather that it is the less useful to them because it is difficult to check its statements, many of which—in fact too many—are statistical in nature. Nevertheless, the author has succeeded in writing a valuable and useful work, particularly for those unable to read Russian.

The point of view of the author is frankly critical of the policies of the Soviet leaders. In many cases the disparaging criticism appears justified on grounds of economic theories or economic facts, but often the actors in the scene have advanced political or social motives as having, rightly or wrongly, as the case may be, determined their actions. In any case, the historian is always on safer ground if he uncovers the facts and factors involved no matter in what field and interprets them in as all-inclusive a manner as possible. To limit them to one set exclusively is to court either bias or incompleteness.

In leading up to the Bolshevik Revolution of November, 1917, the author stresses not only the backwardness of Russia but also the quick upturn just before the war, the planting of the seeds of revolution, and the inability of the Provisional Government to cope with the mounting disorder brought about by the war and the collapse of czardom. He then analyzes the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks who, in obtaining it, virtually gave up what theories they had in regard to the agrarian revolution and soon found themselves the victims of their own words in the cities when the workmen, setting up their committees, seized the factories. They fared no better when their simple ideas on finance met the crucial test.

Ten chapters are devoted to the period of "War Communism", the first attempt to set up a communist state in Russia, which ended in the midst of Allied intervention in the militarization of agriculture and industry and in the Kronstadt Revolt and the famine, in other words, in almost total collapse. The New Economic Policy (1921–1928) is followed through its several phases in some twenty-five chapters. Here the recovery of Soviet Russia to its pre-war production in industry and agriculture in the midst of inflation and deflation is pictured in a wealth of statistical detail. It was in this period that the Soviet leaders acquired the fears and premonitions which led them, after the liquidation of the Stalin-Trotsky controversy, to the adoption of the First Five-Year Plan. The New Economic Policy, like "War Communism" had failed, according to the author, because of its "instability". Agriculture still remained capitalistic. It controlled the food supply of the socialized city. Though agriculture had made possible the bringing of industrial production almost to the pre-war level, it seemed to have paused in its advance and to have failed to produce an export, from which the large investments, necessary to reconstruct socialized industry, whose old equipment was now wearing out, could be financed. It was during these years that the Soviet leaders learned how to manipulate prices and thus maintain industry, almost constantly running into the red, chiefly on the backs of the peasantry.

The last ten chapters of the work are given to the story of the First Five-Year Plan, the results of the first three years of which are surveyed. After pointing out the heavy contribution which the individual peasant households had to make toward the financing of the first plan, the author remarks: "If the necessary means are to be found for carrying out the Second Five-Year Plan, either their condition must be alleviated or, after fifteen years of a hazardous and experimental existence, socialist enterprise must be rendered efficient and established on a profitable basis." Perhaps one other alternative, not suggested by the author, was to be offered, namely, that of long-term and large-scale credits from some capitalist country, suffering from the depression but anxious to set the wheels of its own industry to turning, even at the risk of what might prove to be a bad debt.

The author's conclusions, by way of comparing the two systems of capitalism and communism, are that, while both systems deprive "the majority of human beings of true self-respect and rob them of the joy and pride of self-creative activity", in Soviet Russia "individualism in its most odious forms still flourishes", and that there is emerging there "a society whose tastes and desires are those of the bourgeoisie of the capitalistic West". The old idealistic Bolsheviks have been thrown "on the scrap heap of history". The "heroic days" of the Revolution are over, and the younger generation, "vigorous, pushful, half-educated", is climbing ahead, not as the vanguard of the proletariat, but of the bourgeoisie. These "builders of life" are finding themselves as pioneers in building Stalin's "Socialism in a single country".

The University of California. ROBERT J. KERNER.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by DUMAS MALONE. Volume X., Jasper—Larkin. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933. Pp. x, 617. $250 for the complete set.)

WITH this installment the monumental *Dictionary of American Biography* pauses half way toward its eventual goal. The middle of the alphabet is within hail, and the 674 memoirs offered by the 343 contributors to volume X. bring the total thus far printed to 6796. The publication has proceeded far enough to shed light upon the relative importance that the editorial staff attaches to outstanding political figures. Thomas Jefferson in the present volume is awarded 37 columns as compared with the following allotments in this and earlier volumes: 25 for Benjamin Franklin, 19 for John Adams, 18 each for John Quincy Adams and Alexander Hamilton, 17 for Andrew Johnson, and 16 each for Jefferson Davis and Andrew Jackson. Probably few scholars would agree to this distribution of space, but it may be questioned whether any alternative formula would command very wide support.

Volume X. is distinguished by an unusually high proportion of undistinguished names, a fact which gives the volume exceptional value, for the chief utility of the *Dictionary* is in redeeming persons of secondary importance from unmerited oblivion. Full-length biographies of major characters can usually be found readily elsewhere. In frequency of mention the 79 Johnsens, Johnsons, Johnstons, and Johnstones lead all the rest, though still outshone by the 81 Browns and Brownes of volume III. The Joneses score 62 times and the Kings 30. Among the better known figures treated, the reader will discover particular pleasure in perusing the editor's "Thomas Jefferson", St. George L. Sioussat's "Andrew Johnson", W. E. Stevens's "Sir William Johnson", E. B. Greene's "William Samuel Johnson", C. O. Paullin's "John Paul Jones", C. M. Fuess's "Rufus King" (1755–1827), Royal Cortissoz's "John La Farge", and C. G. Abbot's "Samuel Pierpont Langley". The last article is a model in expounding the significance of scientific findings in terms easily grasped by the lay reader. Sketches of the following men make clear the desirability of fuller treatments of their lives in another place: William Samuel Johnson, Anson Jones, George W. Julian, William D. Kelley, Amos Kendall, Rufus King (1755–1827), and Robert M. La Follette.

It is to be regretted that room was not found for the following persons: John Clarkson Jay (1808–1891), physician and conchologist; David Jayne (1799–1866), patent medicine manufacturer and philanthropist; Francis H. Jenks (1812–1888), founder of the American safe-deposit business; Sara Jewett (1851–1899), actress; Samuel M. Jones (1846–1904), "Golden-Rule" mayor of Toledo; David Kahnweiler (1826–1898), inventor; John Kavanagh (1858–1898), painter; Patrick C. Keely (1816–1896), architect; George Kellogg (1812–1901), inventor; William H. Kennedy (1855–1894), song

writer; John H. Keyser (1819–1899), manufacturer and philanthropist; Jacob Knapp (1800–1874), evangelist; Adolf R. Kraus (1850–1901), sculptor; John Kreusi (1843–1899), inventor and engineer; and John J. Lalor (d. 1899), editor and translator of historical and economic treatises. The editorial work on the present volume is of the usual high standard. The few errors of fact include the statement that Freneau edited the *Federal Gazette* (p. 24) instead of the *National Gazette*, and that the second United States Bank was founded in 1814 (p. 115) instead of 1816. It may also be questioned whether the Lansing-Ishii agreement "had no permanently injurious effects upon China" (p. 610).

Harvard University. A. M. SCHLESINGER.

New Spain and the Anglo-American West: Historical Contributions. Presented to Herbert Eugene Bolton. Two volumes. (Los Angeles: Privately printed. 1932. Pp. xii, 333; 277.)

PROFESSOR Bolton, in spite of continued youth and abounding energy, may well be called "the fortunate patriarch of American history". He fell into a rich heritage, wrought worthily in the field thus opened to him, received merited honors, opened new pathways, and now can count by the score the progeny of his inspiration. Such fortune deserves commemoration and his former students wisely determined that this should take the form of the present volumes.

The recipient of this honor came to the University of Texas on the eve of a historical awakening. The attention of students was beginning to turn toward the Southwest and especially toward the sources that illustrated Spanish achievement. The local School of History, under the leadership of George P. Garrison, had undertaken tentative efforts in this field. A few individuals had actually worked in the Mexican archives! Professor Bolton, a newcomer well trained in the schools of Turner and McMaster, was ready for a task that would call forth his full energy and enthusiasm. He found it on that uncertain frontier that marked the meeting of Anglo-American and Hispanic-American civilizations. A few years' work during the intervals of teaching served to season him for the task and to test in full measure his equipment, as was shown by his contributions to border history, to local ethnology, and above all by his useful *Guide . . . to the Archives of Mexico*. A decade of such tasks fitted him for a wider teaching and research field, and at Stanford and California he has since demonstrated in his voluminous publications, in his inspiring class work, and in the productions of his students, a capacity to labor and to inspire others that has seldom been equaled in the annals of the profession.

The memorial is a documentary work. It early became apparent that the multitude of contributors and the subject matter called for a double title, and that to each separate phase a single volume should be devoted. Hence we

have in volume I. thirteen articles relating to the history of New Spain. They begin with the administration of Viceroy Mendoza and end with the outbreak of the Wars of Independence. Most of these naturally are devoted to the frontier of the viceroyalty stretching from Florida to California and including within its circle Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, and other northern provinces of the Mexican jurisdiction. The topics treated vary from administrative details of the viceregal administration to the problems presented by American penetration of what was later the Louisiana Purchase. Few major events that affect North America as a whole are omitted from this list of contributions. It would be invidious to single out any for special mention. Some of the contributors have prefaced their documents with fairly complete essays. Others have contented themselves with a long introductory note. All have accompanied their documentary text with adequate footnotes which in themselves afford a convenient and virtually complete bibliography of the field covered. This series forms one face of what may be regarded as an honor medal of permanent historical value.

As the obverse face, volume II. is a worthy companion. In this field Professor Bolton naturally worked less as a pioneer than as an active contributor, adding new concepts to those originally presented by Turner. The documents are hardly less rare than their fellows from the Mexican and Spanish archives, but belong to a much more numerous company, and consequently are less conspicuous. They begin with Pike's work on the upper Mississippi and end with the mid-century events that embrace Texas, New Mexico, California, and Oregon. The annotation is apparently more extensive and more varied in character than for the first volume, because the contributors work in more numerous company and in an area where development takes place more rapidly. Ten selections make up this volume.

The volumes are adequate specimens of work by the Lancaster Press, a delight in themselves to the booklover. Each is fully indexed and the second contains a complete bibliography of the writings and maps of Professor Bolton, prepared by his student and associate, Miss Mary Ross. The list of Doctors of Philosophy in History covers two pages, and of Masters more than twice as much space, a worthy roster of a generation of historical research and teaching. The first volume contains as its frontispiece a most satisfying engraving of Professor Bolton, followed by an appreciative sketch of his work and personality. Each volume is separately edited by a group of three contributors, whose names are a guarantee of excellent work. Professor Bolton has cause to congratulate himself upon receiving so complimentary a testimonial.

Northwestern University. ISAAC J. COX.

History of the State of New York. Edited by ALEXANDER C. FLICK, State Historian. Volume I., *Wigwam and Bouwerie;* Volume II., *Under*

Duke and King. [Published under the Auspices of the New York State Historical Association.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1933. Pp. xxxi, 361; xii, 437. $5.00 each.)

THESE handsomely printed and beautifully illustrated volumes of the *History of the State of New York* cannot be exactly appraised by themselves. It is necessary to know how ably and wisely subsequent volumes will deal with the difficult problems that lie beyond the period here treated. It cannot be denied, however, that these volumes are an auspicious beginning. With a gracefully written foreword by Dixon Ryan Fox and an illuminating introduction by Alexander C. Flick they launch into a more comprehensive treatment of the colonial period than can be found in any other place.

The task of the reviewer of a coöperative work of this sort is baffling. Little can be gained by singling out certain chapters for praise or criticism. Chapters dealing with such widely differing subjects as The First Appearance of Man and The Colonial Merchant's Ledger are not exactly comparable, the one with the other. Opinions as to their merits depend upon tastes and upon the interest and knowledge of the particular reader. All that we can reasonably ask in such a work is that the writer of each chapter shall be abreast of his field; that he shall present his work in an interesting manner; and that he shall discard myth and error. This has been accomplished in a remarkable degree, considering the range of topics treated and the number of persons engaged. The chapters are as a rule well done and they are well adapted to the general reader. Furthermore the editor has planned the chapters in such a way as to secure an unusual degree of continuity. Each chapter fits admirably into its place.

As an indication of the contents of these volumes a few of the chapters may be mentioned without disparaging others not so mentioned. The general reader will be grateful for the first two chapters, by Chris A. Hartnagel and Arthur C. Parker, on the geological history of the state and on the first appearance of man. They are adapted to the layman and they are convenient for the professional student of history. The chapter on the white man's discoveries and explorations shows by its compactness and clearness the results of Dr. Crouse's extensive study in this field, as does also his chapter on the French in colonial New York.

It is but a reflection of more recent interests in historical writing to mention the space given to matters that did not find their way into older works. The Economic Pattern of Colonial New York by Samuel McKee, jr., is an illustration of this and it is followed by others in the same field. The reader is readily persuaded that this new *History of the State of New York* will not merely promote a knowledge of the history of the state. It promises to promote further productive work. It is in brief a coöperative enterprise that has drawn together a group of skillful workers. They have acquired reputation through their efforts and it is to be hoped that they will go further.

It is not intended to say that these volumes do not suffer from the defects that attend any coöperative enterprise. We may still long for the master mind that could give us the history of the State of New York in perfect symmetry and proportion, but that appears to be out of the question.

Cornell University. J. P. Bretz.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, January 1, 1682, to June 30, 1683, preserved in the Public Record Office. Edited by F. H. Blackburne Daniell, M.A. Two volumes. (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1932; 1933. Pp. viii, 778; vii, 447. £1 17*s.* 6*d.*; £1 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The Domestic Papers in the Public Record Office do not, as a rule, furnish much material of importance for the student of American colonial history. By the rearrangement of 1907 and following years sundry documents relating to the plantations, which had originally been filed in the office of the secretary of state for the southern department, were transferred to the Colonial Office series, most of them having been calendared already in the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial.* For that reason the volumes under review, which partly close the gap between the first and second series of the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*—the latter beginning with 1689 and now extending to December, 1698—contain practically nothing that throws any significant light on colonial affairs. There are a few references to the tobacco trade with Maryland, to exports and imports in 1681, to Tobago as a plantation, and to the doings of a few individuals—Alexander Spotswood, Sir Edmund Andros, Cranfield of New Hampshire, Culpeper of Virginia, Robert Barclay of East New Jersey, Robert Quary, and Edward Gove who was condemned to death in New Hampshire for treason. There are also a few intriguing items regarding Colonel John Scott, which throw light on his career during these years and show that he was in some way mixed up with the plans of Colonel Blood, the crown stealer. These and a few other minor entries complete the list of items of this character.

The chief value of these volumes lies in the picture they give of England—and in lesser degree of Scotland and Ireland as well—during a period of popular agitation and popular revolt greater than at almost any other time in the history of the British Isles, not excepting even the years of the Civil Wars and the Interregnum. Many of the circumstances leading up to and accompanying the various insurrections in the colonies between 1676 and 1689 can be understood only by a careful consideration of events that were taking place in England at the same time, when the Stuart government was endeavoring to maintain its authority and execute the provisions of the Clarendon Code. These documents deal with four groups of activities: those which concern the aftermath of the Popish Plot and the reaction which followed the close of the last Parliament of Charles II.; those which relate to the attack on the municipal charters and the interference of the crown with

borough government in various parts of England; those which disclose the coercive policy of the administration in suppressing conventicles, prosecuting recusants and fanatics, arresting and imprisoning Quakers (regarding which some harrowing illustrations are given); and finally those which reveal the growing enthusiasm for the Duke of Monmouth, particularly in the west-midland and southwestern counties. One important conclusion readily reached by the reader is the extent to which these activities often interlocked, the same groups and persons being involved in all or many of them at the same time.

The point of view is nearly always that of the government, but it is easy to read between the lines. On one side were those who considered their lives, liberties, and fortunes at stake. They are here called by a great variety of names—fanatics, the mobile or mob, the rabble—rabble-rout, foot rabble, and gaping rabble—rioters, dangerous vermin, the ordinary sort, ordinary mean persons, dissenting opponents, and whigs. On the other side were the well-affected, the loyal gentry and citizens, the loyal party, the king's friends, and honest men. One senses the hysteria of the time, the widespread excitement and bitterness of feeling on both sides—the ill-judged severity of the government against what it deemed the "malice and insolence of the restless spirits", and the persistent disorders and tumults that marked the failure of the royal policy. We can well believe that Secretary Jenkins was right in thinking that the methods of the king's enemies might be transmitted "as a thing of imitation to posterity", for it was in this period and under these ebullient circumstances that the modern whig tradition was born. The volumes are of more than ordinary interest to the worker in American colonial history for these reasons. They help to clarify the course of events in the colonies during the same strenuous years, when circumstances were leading to popular outbreaks in no less than five of the settlements; they throw light on the treatment of the Quakers in England at the time of the founding of Pennsylvania; and they trace to its source the whig tradition of hostility to the Stuarts and all executive authority that has done so much to overstress progressive liberalism and the significance in the history of England and her colonies of "liberty" and popular government.

Yale University. CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789. Edited from the original records in the Library of Congress by JOHN C. FITZPATRICK. Volumes XXVIII., XXIX., January 11–December 30, 1785. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1933. Pp. ix, 1–489; 491–987. $2.00 each.)

BEGINNING with these volumes Dr. Fitzpatrick has inaugurated a commendable alteration in the mode of printing the *Journals*. In 1779 Secretary Thomson opened a Despatch Book in which he entered in tabular form the

communications brought to the attention of Congress, with the essential stages of their course through the congressional mill. In 1781 he inaugurated a Committee Book, wherein was recorded in a similar manner the appointment of committees and the progress of matters assigned to them. Accordingly many of the preliminary steps in the consideration of measures ceased to be given record in the Journal proper. These records are thus an essential part of the proceedings of Congress, and they have accordingly been introduced into footnotes in such a manner that the proceedings upon a subject may be followed from its inception until definitive action was taken. Another new departure, the value of which any student of the *Journals* will appreciate, has been to state briefly the subject of a paper referred to, when the *Journals* have left that subject in obscurity.

The year 1785 was a period of relative calm in the life of Congress. During the past year or two Congress had not been living the quiet life. Chased out of Philadelphia in June, 1783, by a band of mutinous soldiers, that body had drifted from place to place, disgruntled with its situation, dissatisfied with itself. Comfortably established at last in New York, as the new year opened Congress settled down to its chores as peacefully as might be and with what efficiency it was capable. Moreover, it entered upon its tasks with something akin to a renewal of resolve; for the preceding year had been witness to scenes of disgusting turbulence within the assembly and to a disheartening lapse of faith both within and without. There was now an earnest purpose in the body to do its utmost to clear up the mess, financial and other, with which it found itself surrounded. Some attempts toward that end had been made in the preceding year, but no gratifying success had been achieved, and the congressional desk was piled high with unfinished business. The budget, Heaven knew, needed to be balanced; yet how could any budget be balanced with one side of the scales weighed down with obligations and no income whatever with which to counterbalance them? One request made of the states for a grant of power to collect import duties had, after two years of waiting, come to naught by the veto of a single state, and another, somewhat modified in character, was before the states, but that too was destined to lose before the year had ended, and again by the voice of a single state. Meanwhile Congress went about preparing once more its time-worn requisitions, yet the year was far spent before they were ready to be forwarded to the states. Over them had been disputations that did not augur well for the Union. Intimately connected with the solution of the financial problem was the adjustment of the public debt, and scarcely less so the settlement of war accounts, individual and state, multitudinous and complex. Much of the time of Congress was devoted to these tasks. Congress had long had in view the utilization of Western lands as a source of revenue—indeed as the source of its salvation—had promoted the cession of those lands by claimant states, and in 1784 had adopted a notable instrument of

government for the Western territory when it should have become settled. Progress had also been made toward the formulation of a policy for the disposal of those lands, a measure, finally consummated in May, 1785, that lies at the foundation of our public land policy. Several Indian treaties negotiated during the year contributed essentially to the settlement of the Western land problem. In a number of other ways, among them the improvement of its own executive machinery, the Congress of 1785 is to be credited with constructive contributions toward our national government.

Carnegie Institution of Washington. EDMUND C. BURNETT.

Letters of Members of the Continental Congress. Edited by EDMUND C. BURNETT. Volume VI., March 1, 1781, to December 31, 1782. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1933. Pp. liii, 599. Unbound, $3.25; bound, $4.00.)

THE last letters in this volume were written a month after the signing of the preliminary treaty of peace, but before the news reached Philadelphia. The contemporary atmosphere of mingled expectancy and anxiety is suggested in a letter written on December 28, 1782, by a Connecticut member. In his opinion, "the speedy settlement of peace" could not be depended upon; but there was, he thought, more reason to hope for such a conclusion "than We have had at any former Period". There is some reduction in the quantity of material, and a single volume is sufficient to include nearly two years of correspondence. As in earlier issues, the strictly epistolary matter is supplemented by a few other documents, including entries from the manuscript diary of Thomas Rodney of Delaware, notes of debates by Secretary Thomson, two of Witherspoon's speeches, and Madison's memorandum on Vermont and the Western land situation (no. 494). Rodney's observations on his fellow members are piquant, though not necessarily to be taken at their face value. Samuel Adams is credited with a "pretty general knowledge" of congressional business. He was "neither eloquent nor talkative; but having the full command of his passions, and possessing a great deal of caution and Court cunning he is well fitted for a politician in every Case where great and good abilities are not requisite". Witherspoon had "all the design and arch Cunning that is necessary or practiced in an assembly of the kirk of Scotland". As for "a Mr. Madison, of Virginia who with some little reading in the Law is just from the College", Rodney did not think much of him. The young man had "all the self-conceit that is common to youth and inexperience in like cases", but without "that gracefulness and ease which some times makes even the impertinence of youth and inexperience agreeable or at least not offensive" (pp. 19–21).

Thomas Rodney to the contrary notwithstanding, Madison bulks large in this volume and one is reminded again of the debt which the historian of this decade owes to his habit of methodical observation and record. He is

individually responsible for over sixty documents; and he had a hand also in most of the exceptionally numerous official letters of the Virginia delegation. Numerically speaking, Madison's nearest competitor is an obscure New Hampshire member, with about half as many individual letters to his credit. Next in order come Lovell of Massachusetts and Duane of New York, both well represented in earlier volumes. Of the outstanding figures in the first and second Continental Congresses, Samuel Adams and Roger Sherman alone are represented here and both had withdrawn before the end of 1781. Of the coming leaders, Hamilton appeared near the end of 1782 but no letter of his is included except a communication signed by him jointly with another New York delegate. For the years covered by this correspondence, one thinks first of the Yorktown campaign in 1781 and the peace negotiations of 1782; but other topics occupy more space in the congressional correspondence, which as in earlier years deals largely with such matters as currency depreciation, failure of the states to respond to congressional calls, and the consequences of such delinquency. The administration of the Articles of Confederation brought new questions of interpretation and sharp divergence of opinion as to the desirability of strengthening the system. The constructive temper finds expression in Madison's letters; aggressive particularism in those of the Rhode Islander, David Howell.

A striking proportion of the correspondence relates to frontier developments. Of these problems, the most interminably debated—and apparently with the least tangible result—was that of Vermont. There are many illustrations of the interaction between the Vermont issue and state interests in the Trans-Appalachian country; also of the relation between questions of land and jurisdiction on the one side, and, on the other, the attitude of certain states on issues involving the revenue system of the Confederation.

Of special interest as a matter of editorial technique is the skillful treatment of Madison's correspondence with the special problems resulting from the use of a cipher. Most of his letters here published had appeared elsewhere, in whole or in part; but Dr. Burnett has made a distinct advance on the work of earlier editors. When indicated passages are omitted, there is of course room for differences of judgment. In general, a sensible course has apparently been taken; but in one of Madison's letters (pp. 551–552) an omission seems to obscure the succession of topics.

Columbia University. EVARTS B. GREENE.

History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860. By LEWIS CECIL GRAY, assisted by ESTHER KATHERINE THOMPSON. Two volumes. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1933. Pp. 1086. $6.25.)

THIS work has taken over twenty-five years to complete. It has grown out of a doctoral disseration on the plantation, begun in 1908 at the University of

Wisconsin. When other treatments of the plantation appeared, the author took a fresh start by expanding his interests. For eight years he has had the assistance of Miss Thompson who had helped in the preparation of the *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620–1860,* by Bidwell and Falconer, reviewed in this journal (XXXI. 329).

This is the sixth of the Carnegie monographs on American economic history. Commerce, transportation, and agriculture have been dealt with up to the Civil War, and labor and manufactures down to the present day. Clearly agriculture has been given the most intensive treatment. Although this great coöperative effort in writing the Carnegie economic histories has been costly, it has resulted in the assembly of a vast mass of data and in the training of many participants in scientific work. It is to be expected that research of this type will be strongest on the side of compilation, but, of this, few scholars will complain. The reviewer would not be personally ready to urge the continuation of the plan, but, if it is to go forward, it might be expected that the subjects already begun would be brought down to the present. The great territory west of the Mississippi might well be brought into the scheme. Mining, lumbering, and business might be included. But on the whole we are more in need of regional studies than of national treatments.

The author, somewhat in contrast to Bidwell and Falconer, is not so much interested in the technique of agriculture as in the general economic aspects of the subject. The institutional, social, and sectional side of agriculture are dealt with at length. One might call this book the commercial and social history of Southern agriculture. This breadth of treatment lends interest and variety to the book. All serious students will want to possess this work and many general readers will go through it from cover to cover.

At this point it is pertinent to observe that there is developing a similarity of interest and treatment of American history. Economic history has become humanized and general history strongly economic. An American historian once asked this question: "Why do you call yourself an economic historian; are we not all economic historians now?"

The thesis or central emphasis of this work is the view that Southern agriculture was commercial from the beginning, but on the other hand that the South has never been commercial. In early days, and somewhat still, the South has been backward in developing loanable capital, banks, merchants, manufactures, and flourishing towns.

To the author the American plantation arose out of European capitalism:

> In all three of the colonial enterprises which constituted the principal nuclei of settlement in the South—Virginia, South Carolina, and Louisiana—the plantation system had its origins in the undertakings of capitalistic associations, vested with governmental authority, to establish agricultural and commercial colonies. While the several colonial enterprises were in part the outgrowth of nationalistic ambitions, they were promoted and made possible

by investors from the nobility, gentry, and bourgeoisie who were essentially interested in deriving profits from the sums invested (I. 341).

The author's view of the background of the Civil War may be summed up in the following sentence, which is quoted for its substance rather than its form. "However much slavery was the primary cause of the great struggle between the sections, and however influential the increasing political disparity, the increasing economic inferiority of the South was a scarcely less important influence" (II. 929).

The subject covered is divided into three periods—up to the close of the Revolution, whence to the invention of Whitney's cotton gin, then to the Civil War. The first period is given more space than the other two combined and is based somewhat more upon original sources. In fact it is hard to escape the conclusion that the author was more interested in the first period.

After dealing with grain and other crops, systems of cultivation, and livestock, the author presents three excellent chapters on the tobacco industry and trade. Tobacco is planted, cared for, packed, stored, transported, sold abroad in various markets, and the returns brought back to America. Here we have the whole picture of tobacco, not just the American part lopped off from the European.

Other notable topics are the colonial land system, credit and marketing, commercialism and self-sufficiency, social classes, the management of the plantation, the beginning of the cotton industry, market organization, and attempts at economic reorganization before the Civil War. Useful statistical tables, a bibliography of primary and secondary sources used, and a detailed index are included.

The reviewer cannot help noting the lack of extended presentations of life and work on specific farms and plantations. Some readers will regret the absence of full treatment of crops and livestock. Certainly the author might have been of service to the ambitious researcher by pointing out the subjects that he thinks might be more intensively studied. No philosophy of history is presented; none is necessary. The author is content to set forth the facts and here and there broad generalizations which give the facts significance.

This is a notable addition to economic historical literature, because a useful compendium, a judicious selection of facts both large and small, a key to a vast array of sources, and the defense of a deep-cutting thesis that the South had a commercial agriculture without a well-balanced commerce. Seldom is one given the opportunity to read a book of such high excellence, broad sweep, and ripe scholarly judgment.

Harvard University. N. S. B. Gras.

War out of Niagara: Walter Butler and the Tory Rangers. By Howard Swiggett. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1933. Pp. xxv, 309. $3.50.)

THIS volume appears as the second in the New York State Historical Association series recently inaugurated under the editorship of Professor Dixon Ryan Fox. The editor could hardly have made a better selection. A careful reader will not be likely to question the opinion expressed by John Buchan, who writes the preface: "Mr. Swiggett has brought to his task not only the methods of sound scholarship, but a judicial integrity." The reading in boyhood of tales of the Revolution in Tryon County, New York, in which Walter Butler figured as the legendary villain, started Mr. Swiggett upon a long quest for authentic information about that obscure personage. The result is a book written with scrupulous care, not only in the immediate events chronicled but in all that concerns their historical background, and at the same time with distinct literary charm. What is the volume's contribution to Revolutionary history? Primarily, the almost complete destruction of the portentous legend of the Butler villainies. The author demonstrates, it seems beyond question, that with one exception no raid in which Walter Butler participated was marked by atrocities. The exception was Cherry Valley, where the band of Tories and Indians was jointly led by Butler and the Mohawk, Joseph Brant. The stock picture of this affair has portrayed a noble savage revolted at the bloody murders instigated if not actually perpetrated by his white colleague. From the best available contemporary evidence, as Mr. Swiggett shows, Butler, with all his attention centered on the unsuccessful attack upon the fort, was at first unaware of what the Indians were about in the village, and when informed, detached much-needed men to prevent its continuance. At Wyoming Valley Walter Butler was not present, but his father, John Butler, led the expedition. Again discarding legend in favor of contemporary evidence from both sides, Mr. Swiggett shows that there were here no slayings of women and children nor of prisoners. There was no "Wyoming massacre". In short the Butlers, father and son, conducted war according to the rules of the time. There was vast destruction of property, and Indians and riff-raff sometimes got out of hand, on the one side as on the other. Nor were the Butlers responsible for involving the Indians in the war. That they should be drawn in Mr. Swiggett thinks inevitable; they had been used in all preceding wars. But he shows incontestably that John Butler opposed the Indian alliance up to about the time of the Burgoyne-St. Leger campaign. Against him were the Johnsons—Sir John and Guy—Daniel Claus, and Brant—the "Johnson Dynasty" as Swiggett dubs them. The Johnson intrigue against the Butlers is not the least interesting thread of the narrative. The Johnson policy prevailed and the Butlers became effective instruments in its execution. If Walter Butler does not emerge clearly as a personality, it is the fault not of the author but of the surprisingly slim source material extant. At any rate, an authentic figure of a soldier, brave, capable, and loyal to his king, now supplants the "archfiend" of the legend.

The University of Buffalo. JULIUS W. PRATT.

Indian Removal: the Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians. By GRANT FOREMAN. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1932. Pp. 415. $4.00.)

IN *Indians and Pioneers* Mr. Foreman gave us an account of the triangular struggle between the Plains Indians, the white settlers, and the Five Civilized Tribes for the possession of Arkansas and Oklahoma. In *Indian Removal,* he describes the process by which the third of these protagonists was brought upon the scene where that struggle was enacted. He states his purpose and the limitations which he has set for himself in his preface: "The author has undertaken here merely a candid account of the removal of these southern Indians, so that the reader may have a picture of that interesting and tragic enterprise as revealed by an uncolored day-by-day recital of events. Nor has he attempted an interpretation of these events or of the actions and motives of the people connected with them." The volume is divided into five books, each one dealing with the removal of one of the Five Tribes. The day-by-day recital of events is given in extraordinary detail, with a wealth of names and dates and with copious quotations from contemporary narratives. It is based upon extensive and painstaking research in government documents, newspapers, personal correspondence, and printed accounts. But it is not history. It is rather a thorough-going collection of material and a guide for the future historian. There is not only no interpretation of the events and actions narrated, no attempt to ascertain their causes or evaluate their effects, but there is no correlation of the narratives in the several books. The author has collected and made available a mass of interesting and valuable information. He has failed in his announced purpose of giving the reader a picture of this important movement in American history.

The Northern Indians, with the exception of the Iroquois, were primarily hunters. Their tribes were scattered over vast areas from which they disappeared gradually and almost imperceptibly as the result of battles, massacres, and the effects of the white man's diseases. Small bands moved westward from time to time before the pressure of white settlement, but there was no great migration of whole nations such as characterized the removal of the Indians from the Southern states. There the Indians were primarily agriculturalists with permanent dwellings and they were deeply attached to the soil where their ancestors had lived for generations. Their forced removal to the lands beyond the Mississippi in the decade following the Removal Bill of 1830 was a movement of peoples on a grand scale. It had profound effects upon the region which they were forced to evacuate and upon the region where they reëstablished themselves. The day-to-day story of their almost incredible sufferings as they moved westward along the "Trail of Tears" is well worth recording, but the whole movement in all its phases and in all its implications still awaits a historian.

The volume is illustrated with six maps and twenty-two drawings and

photographs. There is a satisfactory bibliography and an excellent index.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH C. GREEN.

The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics. By WILLIAM ERNEST SMITH, Ph.D., Professor of American History, Miami University. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. viii, 516; vi, 523. $7.50.)

FRANCIS PRESTON BLAIR and his two sons, Montgomery and Francis Preston, jr., constituted a close family corporation, unique for its continuity and for its incessant political activity. For nearly sixty years few important political controversies in the United States escaped the influence of one or all of the Blair triumvirate, but the elder Blair was by all odds the most influential member of the family. Initiated into politics in Kentucky, where he was a member of the "New-Court party", and a close friend of Amos Kendall, he became an ardent follower of Andrew Jackson and an indefatigable opponent of the Clay-Adams coalition, and of the Calhoun faction of the Democratic party. Under the able editorship of Blair the Washington *Globe* was for fifteen years probably the most influential Democratic journal in the country. A loyal friend and confidant of both Jackson and Van Buren, Blair undoubtedly exercised great political power, but he remained a factional leader. Even though he became a free trader and an anti-abolitionist, he was unable to gain the confidence of the Southern wing of his party or the support of Northern leaders such as Buchanan, Cass, Douglas, and Marcy. It was practically impossible, therefore, for him to continue as the recognized party spokesman after the election of President Polk. He gradually drifted away from the Democratic party, united with the Free-Soilers in 1848, and finally, along with his two sons joined the Republican party. Considered radical Republicans in 1860, the Blairs became conservatives before the end of Lincoln's administration, championed the cause of President Johnson, and eventually drifted back into the Democratic fold.

Generally adroit and farsighted, the Blairs were occasionally impolitic, if their real and their avowed objects were the same. Thus they desired to preserve the Union but sought to disrupt the Democratic party; they wished to prevent the Civil War but opposed compromise; they disliked Secretary Chase and the so-called radicals but employed violent attack instead of conciliation; and their support of Greeley against Adams at the Liberal Republican Convention of 1872 was scarcely less than stupid.

Professor Smith has examined the Blair family papers and in addition the important and widely scattered available materials dealing with his subject. He has described not only the variable political fortunes of the Blairs but has given ample space to a description of the beautiful country home of the elder Blair; to the services of Montgomery Blair as a lawyer and as an able Postmaster-General; and to the military career of Francis Preston Blair, jr.

If Professor Smith has written with an indulgent hand regarding the Blairs, he has accomplished his task skillfully and adequately. His story is one of factional discords, insatiable personal ambition and longing for office, loyal support of friends, and bitter attack upon enemies. Professor Smith does not attempt to deal with the fundamental economic and social influences in the United States during the time of the Blairs. He is wary of interpretations, except in so far as they are implicit in the selection of material and the choice of phraseology. He deals with personalities and politics, with some of the raw materials rather than the finished product of history.

Regarding the merits of the controversies in which the Blairs engaged there have been and probably will continue to be differences of opinion. Historical perspective, however, and accumulated data have occasioned the revision of many ideas concerning the Civil War. It may have been unfortunate, therefore, that Professor Smith decided to include in his account of the Blairs a great amount of political history not essential to his subject. Regarding this history, much of which is polemical, many loose statements and broad generalizations appear which add spirit to the narrative, but also lend a tone and suggest an approach which Professor Smith may or may not have intended. To mention only a few examples, it is somewhat surprising to find that the "black cloud of slavery . . . threatened to destroy the freedom of the laboring man" (I. 223), and that during the debates in Congress over the compromise measures of 1850, "men trembled in terror at the threats of the fire-eaters of the South " (I. 259). If it is maintained that the Republican party "was born in a revolt of the masses" (I. 308), and that the Proclamation of Emancipation was the "blow that turned the tide of the war" (II. 205) and eventually "broke the spirit of the people" in the South (II. 221), the evidence should be fully given. The fact must not be lost sight of, however, that any criticism of this sort almost invariably applies to controversial questions and should not obscure the general excellence of Professor Smith's main contribution, which is the political history of the Blair family. Such a work as this has been greatly needed and should receive a cordial welcome.

Tufts College. RUHL J. BARTLETT.

Grover Cleveland: a Study in Courage. By ALLAN NEVINS. [American Political Leaders, edited by Allan Nevins.] (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1932. Pp. xiii, 832. $5.00.)

MR. NEVINS has achieved in this biography an important contribution to the history of the last half of the nineteenth century. Obedient to the canons of historical criticism he is neither an apologist nor a critic but a sympathetic interpreter. The result is a vivid picture of the man and his times. What surprises one most, perhaps, is the brevity with which the pre-presidential period can be treated. In spite of intimate touches which reveal the forces that entered into the making of the man—his Puritan family background,

his education, his early employment at Buffalo and his Civil War experiences there (when with two brothers in the field he kept the home fires burning for his widowed mother), his rise in the law, his early dabbling in politics, and his later success as mayor of Buffalo and as governor of New York—all of his career down to the Presidency is covered in less than two hundred pages. Professional influences operated upon the increasingly portly bachelor, who was also known for his leadership of "the easy-going sociability of the hotel lobbies and saloons" and for his fondness for hunting and fishing. Cleveland won a reputation as a hard-working but quiet and unobtrusive student of the law, as a man of rugged honesty and of stubborn defense of his conviction of what was right—forces that carried over into politics to make him the political figure that he became. His biographer describes his firmness in standing out against those who crossed him as "his Palmerstonian quality, his 'you-be-damnedness', as a friend once called it" (p. 135).

Strange as it may seem, this man eventually went to the presidential office with an utter lack of a program or policies on national issues—with simple but aggressive political honesty to distinguish him from dozens of other political leaders. But there was need of honesty in a day when the spoilsman and the exploiter robbed the public almost without stint. Mr. Nevins does not hesitate to point to the long chain of "accidents" that led to the White House, including those of the campaign of 1884, which is brilliantly analyzed. He sees in Cleveland the limitations of a reformer as set off against a progressive; he suggests that in the eighties "the hour of progressivism had not struck but the need for more efficiency and earnestness in government was great" (p. 215). Yet he later comes to see the tragic consequences of a lack of statesmanship in meeting the new issues that were already demanding attention in these formative years, issues of which Cleveland had almost no consciousness until cabinet-making forced him to block out crudely the main lines of his policy. Even then there was no display of parliamentary leadership—if Cleveland was not inherently incapable of assuming such a rôle—to round out the contributions made possible by his rugged honesty and superb courage. Perhaps the blame belongs as much—or more—upon the chaotic party situation which evaded issues rather than confronted them and made parliamentary leadership difficult if not impossible.

This is not to deny Cleveland's preëminence in the presidential office. The author presents a sympathetic and convincing picture of a silver policy that was grounded in the convictions of a lifetime, although he does not hesitate to point out that, despite the creation of a Department of Agriculture and other agrarian concessions, this was accompanied by a failure to grasp the problems "that meant life and death to the farmer", especially that of farm credit to relieve the crushing burden of mortgage debt.

Rugged honesty and courage achieved new levels of presidential leadership in facing the issues of the tariff, interstate commerce, labor, and foreign

policy. The biographer challenges the soundness of the Pullman strike policy in which "undoubtedly Cleveland did his duty as he saw it, or rather as Olney unhappily showed it to him" (p. 627), and he feels that Olney exerted an equally unfortunate influence upon the President in the Venezuela affair. In the latter case he concludes that American policy actually and unexpectedly improved Anglo-American relations, although it committed the nation to "a new bias toward rigorous action in foreign relations and the acceptance of overseas responsibility—a bias thoroughly distasteful to Cleveland" (p. 648), as should be evident from his anti-imperialist policy on Hawaii, confused as that was by the ineptness of Secretary Gresham.

Mr. Nevins has produced in every sense a stimulating volume such as might well have set the standard for the series of biographies which he edits and to which this work belongs. Minor errors which were patent in the first issue were eliminated in the fourth printing and no longer qualify the excellence of his achievement.

Western Reserve University. ARTHUR C. COLE.

The American Federation of Labor: History, Policies, and Prospects. By LEWIS L. LORWIN, with the assistance of JEAN ATHERTON FLEXNER. [Publications of the Brookings Institution, 50.] (Washington: The Brookings Institution. 1933. Pp. xix, 573. $2.75.)

HISTORIANS as well as economists are greatly indebted to Mr. Lorwin and the Brookings Institute of Economics for this thorough and much needed appraisal of the American Federation of Labor. The first 300 pages, approximately two-thirds of the main text, deal with the history of the Federation. The earlier history, already adequately treated in Commons's *History of Labor in the United States,* is passed over somewhat lightly. The rapidly shifting scene since 1909 is described in more detail and with an appreciation of the interplay of the larger industrial and political forces. The last third of the book describes the structure of the Federation and of its constituent unions, gives analyses of current problems, and ventures into the field of interpretation and outlook. The style lacks the warmth and texture of personal and colorful detail, and one senses little of stress and drama and intimacy of contact with industry. But the rigorously objective handling of the subject is convincing, and the book is by far the most adequate account of the recent labor movement in America that has come to the reviewer's notice.

The author evidences a keen understanding of the larger historical forces which have made the Federation what it is to-day. The dynamic, expanding nature of American industry, he explains, has prevented the social stratification of wage-earning groups. The racial and cultural heterogeneity of the working classes has retarded concerted action. The rise of national consciousness in the industrial countries of Europe was accompanied by conflicts between classes and a cleavage between feudal, monarchical, bourgeois,

and working-class groups, whereas in America sectional and racial conflicts, combined with doctrines of individual equality and freedom of opportunity, overshadowed class distinctions and tended to set different groups of workers against each other, as natives against immigrants, and blacks against whites. The most important cleavage, from the point of view of labor organization, has been the separation of the skilled workers from the unskilled. The Federation was founded on unions of skilled workers, and the continued "group egotism" of these workers has dominated the working-class movement and has established a kind of labor feudalism which has severely restricted the Federation's authority. Some of the bitterest conflicts have been waged between the unions of skilled craftsmen themselves over questions of jurisdiction; and the Federation, in spite of a recent trend toward industrial unionism, has found it necessary to devote a large part of its resources to these internal problems.

The declining relative importance of skilled trades represented in most of the constituent unions, the rise of new industries with unorganized workers, the impact of countermoves by employers as in the formation of company unions, and finally, the years of depression since 1929, have combined to put upon the Federation such a terrific strain that the alternatives confronting it are decline or reorganization. The oft-repeated assertion that the Federation is "on its deathbed" is discredited, though "a slow disintegration" is not impossible. But the author's view is that "the trend toward a semi-legal, quasi-public unionism in the United States is a phase of a movement which seems world-wide in character". "Free" unionism, like "free" capitalism, can hardly be expected to withstand the impact of forces which demand, for survival, a far greater degree of economic discipline and coördination than has characterized our pioneering and individualistic past. Recent developments in public policy point impressively in the direction of the author's prediction.

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. WITT BOWDEN.

SHORTER NOTICES

Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Editor-in-Chief, Edwin R. A. Seligman; Associate Editor, Alvin Johnson. Volumes IX., X. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xxi, 661; pp. xxi, 652, $7.50 each.) These volumes of the *Encyclopaedia* carry the articles from "Laboulaye" to "moratorium". In these two volumes there is but one notable collection of studies, namely that dealing with law; the rest is a miscellany of longer and shorter articles. Of this material, however, a large amount is not easily available in any English encyclopedia. Particularly valuable from this point of view are the small biographies of lesser non-American figures. The *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* is rendering an outstanding service in making easily available so

much factual material, the accumulation of which by the individual scholar would otherwise require a large expenditure of time. In these two volumes as in the earlier ones the authors are drawn in almost equal number from Europe and from North America with occasional representatives from the Far East and from the southern Pacific area. The *Encyclopaedia* continues to maintain its high standards. It has already become a monumental work.

Yale University. RALPH H. GABRIEL.

Primitive Arts and Crafts: an Introduction to the Study of Material Culture. By R. U. Sayce. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xiii, 291, $2.00.) If we are ever to have a right understanding of human cultures as a whole, we must not neglect the careful study of the material cultures of primitive peoples. The author's object is to give the reader a general idea of the principles involved in a study of this kind. Some of the topics treated are inventions *vs.* discoveries, the effects of migrations, environment, race, and seasonal rhythm, on culture; the causes of variations and mutations; the effect of material and technique, of fancy and of knack, as well as of function. A chapter is devoted to linked traits and culture complexes; methods and rates of diffusion, and barriers to diffusion. The spread of the use of tobacco around the world, unaccompanied by any ceremonial attributes, is given as an example of diffusion. The final chapter deals with independent origins, parallel development, and convergence. The importance of archæological evidence is stressed throughout and every page is enriched through references to the literature on the subject. The author's grasp of the matter in hand is such and his text is so skillfully condensed that one is inclined to pardon his use of the term "Amerindian" in one or two places.

Yale University. GEORGE GRANT MACCURDY.

Weltgeschichte in einem Band. Von Dr. J. Jastrow, Professor an der Universität Berlin. (Berlin, Verlag Ullstein, 1932, pp. ix, 482, 8 M.) The value and distinction of this highly compressed but luminously written volume lie in the author's reinterpretation of familiar subject matter. Professor Jastrow is of the opinion that the time has come to emphasize *Weltgeschichte* as the *Geschichte der Menschheit,* and to judge past civilizations by the degree to which they advanced the concept of human unity. With this aim in mind he has attempted to rewrite the story of the past as *"die Geschichte des Zusammenhanges zwischen den Völkern der Erde",* and to relate it, if one may borrow Mr. H. G. Wells's phrase, as "the common adventure of mankind".

The application of this new measuring rod involves a shift in the conventional scale of values. Almost half the space here devoted to ancient Greece, for instance, is concerned with Alexander's bid for universal empire.

Imperial titles, codes of law, the tenets of successive religions are all ranged and classified with reference to this Ariadne's thread of human unity, the golden clue to history's tangled skein. The wealth of political, military, and biographical detail which pads the older texts is ruthlessly discarded, and isolated cultures (those of Mexico and Peru, for example) are ignored because, presumably, they contributed nothing durable to the heritage of mankind. Such a method of selection may be open to criticism, but the result in this case is indubitably a success, a world history integrated in terms of culture and commerce to replace the familiar epic of conflict and conquest.

The solvent power of Professor Jastrow's style has enabled him to condense a vast amount of information into 427 pages of narrative, and further facts are available in the thirty-two tables or summaries scattered through the work. A chronological list of significant events in world history, a table of the major dynasties, and an excellent index complete the work, but it is to be regretted that only two maps are included and those of somewhat inferior quality. The type is attractive and reveals remarkably few errors.

New York University. GEOFFREY BRUUN.

Essais d'histoire sociale: I., La Grèce antique. Par Joseph Laurent, doyen de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Nancy. [Annales de l'Est.] (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1933, pp. 214, 20 fr.) This essay, which comes to the rather obvious conclusion that "la classe moyenne est l'élément essentiel et nécessaire de l'équilibre d'une société", spreads over a wide field and nowhere goes very deep. Here and there it contains interesting comment on political phenomena, ancient and modern, but in general it is not so much a historical investigation as an exposition of the author's opinions. The examples and citations with which these opinions are supported seem to be garnered mainly from handbooks, and those not the most recent. To take a typical instance, the brief sketch of commerce and banking (pp. 126 ff.) is based on Guiraud and ignores the numerous important studies of the last decade or two. The citations of ancient sources only very rarely include inscriptions, even in the section on economic life, and are for the most part the familiar stock quotations; in general these are lumped together with little regard for chronological sequence or relative worth.

The author is prone to generalize on the basis of his own definitions, as in the assertion that no Greek state undertook officially the 'moral' education of its citizens (pp. 55 ff.); or to ignore uncertainties and controversies, as in his pronouncements upon the relative importance of agriculture and trade (pp. 95 ff.); or to disregard evidence which does not support his views, as in his comment upon individual fortunes (p. 98). There are many points which call for correction or at least reservation; the following instances, which could be multiplied *ad libitum*, are fairly representative of method and results: the selection of Antiphon, Andocides, and Lysias to illustrate

the orator's personal responsibility, and the statement that Lysias (a metic) "perdit ses droits civiques" (p. 21); the observation that the Greek states were "créés pour réprimer les passions de l'humanité" (p. 44); the unqualified assertion that the penalty for shipping grain elsewhere than to Athens was death (p. 115); the inclusion of the *periœci* with the helots as serfs (pp. 159 f.), and the omission from the discussion of serfage of any allusion to the laws of Gortyna; the appearance of Miltiades, Cimon, Demosthenes *père*, and Apollodorus, among others, in a list of political leaders for the latter half of the fifth century (pp. 182 ff.); *et similiter cetera.*

The University of California. GEORGE M. CALHOUN.

Early Civilization in Thessaly. By Hazel D. Hansen, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Classical Literature, Stanford University. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, no. 15, edited by David M. Robinson.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1933, pp. xix, 203, $4.00.) Dr. Hansen's book satisfies a real need, reviewing as it does the evidence published by Tsoundas (1908) and by Wace (1912), and correlating it with the data more recently obtained from the Balkans and adjacent areas. After a survey of the previous archæological investigations in Thessalian prehistory, there is a chapter on the geography of this region, based largely on the author's travels. During 1924 and 1927–1928, Miss Hansen visited over eighty mounds, in addition to other sites, in Thessaly. Four maps enhance the value of this monograph; particularly welcome is the map of the Balkans.

In chapters III., IV., and V. the characteristic house-types, burials, pottery, and miscellaneous objects from the various sites are discussed period by period and numerous illustrations accompany the text. In chapter VI., Thessaly in the Prehistoric World—possibly the most valuable section of this work—the author discusses the relations shown by archæology to have existed between Thessaly and the surrounding regions. This, happily, necessitated a brief survey of the contemporary cultures in the Danubian area and southeastern Europe and in Macedonia, Thrace, Troy, Greece, and Sicily and southern Italy.

The Neolithic Age (*ca.* 3000–2300 B.C.) marked the truly distinctive period of Thessalian culture. Its influence was felt in central and southern Hellas and spread to the north and possibly as far as Sicily. At the same time Thessaly was receiving influences from the north, although not so much from the Danubian area as has been supposed by some scholars.

In the Bronze Age (*ca.* 2300–1200 B.C.) Thessaly was virtually a province of the Ægean civilization, although its culture had become decadent by the time of the great period of Mycenæ. Then the influx of Macedonian peoples ushered in the Early Iron Age (*ca.* 1200–1050 B.C.) and again Thessaly occupied a distinctive position, now more closely associated with Macedonia than with the rest of Hellas.

Four short tabular appendixes, a selected bibliography, and an adequate index conclude this important work. Miss Hansen's monograph deserves a place alongside of those great works on Thessaly: Tsoundas, *Dimeni and Sesklo,* and Wace and Thompson, *Prehistoric Thessaly.*

The University of North Carolina. J. PENROSE HARLAND.

The Mediterranean in the Ancient World. By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D., Vere Harmsworth Professor of Naval History and Fellow of Christ's College in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xi, 184, $2.25.) This book, intended alike for the classicist and general reader, follows the method of such works as A. M. Shepard's *Sea Power in Ancient History,* in appraising the influence of the Mediterranean. Thus it shows the natural advantages favoring early man in his struggle with that sea; traces the development of shipbuilding from Odysseus's four days' efforts on Ogygia to the great Alexandrine corn-transport in which St. Paul was wrecked; and emphasizes the importance of the control of the two chief straits—Hellespont and Messina—neglected by earlier peoples, but fully sensed by the Romans, who thereby attained naval supremacy in the Mediterranean.

Since Rome was the only ancient state which ranked as an efficient sea power over a period of centuries, her maritime progress is here for the first time adequately outlined in three-fifths of the book (chs. III.-VI.), and contrasted with the weaker efforts of her predecessors—Phœnicians, Greek city-states (especially Rhodes, the only important one in sea affairs), and the Hellenistic monarchies. Here by far the most interesting and provocative chapter is III.—The Punic Struggle for Sicily. It recounts not only the inception of Roman sea power, but gives a new angle from which to estimate the importance of that struggle. The notion that the underlying cause of Hannibal's failure was "the loss of Sicily and of maritime supremacy by Carthage in the First Punic War" is well taken. For if Hannibal could have struck at Italy through Sicily rather than over the Alps the termination of the war would have been very different.

The author refuses to enter into the "Minoan Maze", though admitting that the Cretans were early "lords of the Eastern Mediterranean" (p. 43) and that Minoan seamen "preceded the Phoenicians in long-distance voyages into the Western Mediterranean" (p. 33). But nothing is said of the scattered Minoan place-names on the shores of that sea from the Ægean to Spain, a knowledge of which has robbed the Phœnicians, long regarded as the only precursors of the Greeks, of much of their importance in maritime discovery. More might have been said also of Egyptian nautical experience—especially of the voyage of Phœnician sailors around Africa under the Pharaoh Necho, which ranked with the later one of Nearchus across the Indian Ocean, and which would have shown the falsity of the statement that "no story of a Phoenician voyage survives except that of Hanno" (p. 44).

The author's rejection of Strabo's idea, elaborated in our day by Bérard in *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée,* that the Phœnicians passed on their nautical knowledge to the Greeks instead of keeping a monopoly of trade routes by circulating fear-inspiring legends (p. 52), is historical; and he seems to favor the recent suggestion of Cary and Warmington—in *The Ancient Explorers,* that the stories of the Odyssey may well have been the fruit of Minoan rather than of Phœnician sea lore as Bérard wrongly maintained.

The University of Pennsylvania. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Preliminary Report of the Fourth Season of Work, October, 1930—March, 1931. Edited by P. V. C. Baur, Professor of Ancient History and Classical Archaeology in Yale University, M. I. Rostovtzeff, Sterling Professor of Ancient History and Classical Archaeology in Yale University, and Alfred R. Bellinger, Assistant Professor of Greek and Latin in Yale University. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1933, pp. xiii, 290, 26 plates, $3.00.) In a brief notice it is impossible to do more than indicate some of the results of the season's work. The Triumphal Arch was further excavated. It had three passages, and its total height was about 14 *m.* or perhaps somewhat more. The inscription on the two faces of the attic shows that it was erected in honor of Trajan, A. D. 116 (117 on p. 4). A great part of the ramparts facing southeast and of those facing the desert was excavated with results that throw light upon the military organization of Dura under the Romans. The Temple of the Palmyrene Gods was completely cleared, and the frescoes discovered in 1921, 1922, and 1923, were uncovered and photographed. The Palace or Inner Redoubt, which was probably built when the Macedonians founded the town, was entirely cleared and is now the most impressive and well-preserved building of Dura. Several temples, houses, and other buildings were excavated with interesting results.

Carved inscriptions discovered are relatively few, but one gives the name of a new deity, Zeus Baetylos. Graffiti were found in great numbers. Many of them were inventories or accounts which give information concerning conditions in the third century A.D. Others, very numerous, were scratched drawings, many of which depict armed horsemen. Most, if not all, of these were drawn in the third century A.D. Painted terracotta plaques for wall decoration; a number of voussoirs with reliefs; a fine silver vase with a Syriac inscription; a few statuettes; two Babylonian cylinders which may perhaps indicate that the site was inhabited before the Seleucid times are among the objects discovered. Evidently the results of this season's work will be valuable to students of political and military history, of social and economic conditions, of religion, and of the history of art.

This is an excellent report. The book is well printed and illustrated and contains several valuable discussions. There is an index of the inscriptions but no general index.

The Library of Congress. HAROLD N. FOWLER.

Byzantine Civilisation. By Steven Runciman, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1933, pp. 320, $5.00.) The present volume is the third chip from Mr. Runciman's workshop. It comprises a brief sketch of the cultural history of the Byzantine empire. The author in a short yet succinct outline covers the social and cultural aspects of the state. The chapters are of somewhat unequal value. Chapter II., which gives an outline of the political history, might well, in the reviewer's opinion, have been omitted. Chapter IV., on the Administration, gives a useful summary of the literature; chapters VI.-VIII. on the Army and Navy, Diplomatic Service, and Commerce are helpful, and give a number of apposite references to sources and secondary literature on these topics, some of the latter being inaccessible in English. The weakest section in the reviewer's estimation, is chapter X. on the Literature, which is superficial and contains some positive misstatements. Chapter XI. on Art is rather compressed, and chapter XII., Byzantium and its Neighbors, is rather too concise. The book gives a good summary of the field, except as noted above, but the author has striven to cover a broad field in too few pages, and in consequence has tended to fall between two stools.

Harvard University. ROBERT P. BLAKE.

On Ancient Central-Asian Tracks: Brief Narrative of Three Expeditions in Innermost Asia and North-Western China. By Sir Aurel Stein, K.C.I.E. (London, Macmillan and Company; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xxiv, 342, $10.00.) We have here a condensed account of the author's two personal narratives of archæological and geographical exploration: *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan* (1903) and *Ruins of Desert Cathay* (1912), and his eleven great quarto volumes of detailed reports entitled: *Ancient Khotan* (1907), *Serindia* (1921), and *Innermost Asia* (1928). This new volume is based on lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute, Boston, and brings together the results of nearly seven years of arduous exploration, and yet more years of painstaking study on the part of his European collaborators, some of whom devoted their best years to interpretating his finds.

Most of the 147 illustrations (sixteen in color) appeared previously in the above-mentioned volumes, but because of their historical significance and superb execution, reproduction in this convenient form is decidedly welcome, particularly since several of the earlier works are now out of print. By looking back on his experiences it was possible for the author to abandon actual chronological sequence and merge the accounts according to their geographical setting—maintaining at the same time the high literary standard of his previous narratives. The story of Sir Aurel's fortuitous appearance in 1907 at the Cave of the Thousand Buddhas, with its walled-in chamber of manuscripts and paintings (on paper and silk), none later than 1035 A. D., remains

one of the most thrilling narratives in the annals of discovery. Thanks to his tact and persistence the British Museum now possesses the oldest specimen of a printed book so far known, dated 868 A. D., and thousands of scrolls whose like we shall not soon discover again.

The Library of Congress. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL.

Actes et documents anciens intéressants la Belgique, conservés aux Archives de l'État à Vienne, 1196–1356. Publiés par Henri Laurent, associé C.R.B. à l'Université de Bruxelles. [Commission royale d'histoire.] (Brussels, Maurice Lamertin, 1933, pp. xiv, 224.)

Inventaire analytique des Chartes de la Collégiale de Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liége. Tome II. Par L. Lahaye, conservateur honoraire des archives de l'État, à Liége. [Commission royale d'histoire.] (Brussels, Maurice Lamertin, 1931 [1933], pp. 505.) M. Laurent has carefully studied the documents dealing with the history of the Low Countries which the Austrian government carried to Vienna in 1794 when expelled from the Austrian Netherlands by the victorious advance of the soldiers of the French republic. There are one hundred and twenty-four letters in all, the last bearing the date October 5, 1356. M. Laurent has indicated where those already published may be found; of the others, hitherto *inédits,* he has carefully prepared texts. These form a valuable contribution to the historical literature dealing with the problems confronting Netherlandish princes, especially during the early years of the Hundred Years' War. Since this struggle involved England, France, and the Empire, they may be considered equally valuable for the history of all Western Europe. Students will find much new data concerning the policies of the rulers of Brabant, Flanders, Guelders, Juliers, Cleves, and Hainault, Holland, and Zeeland. An interesting example is the famous accord between the duke of Brabant and the count of Hainault, Holland, and Zeeland of April 1, 1336, at Dendermonde. The original is in a very bad condition but M. Laurent has been able to decipher a number of passages not printed in the text prepared by Van den Bergh in 1849. Another important letter is the one whereby Edward III. on August 22, 1339, recognized an indebtedness of 207,000 florins to the duke of Brabant. The publication of such documents is a most laudable undertaking.

M. Lahaye's volume contains analyses of documents belonging to the old archives of the important collegiate church of St. John of Liége. These are preserved in the Archives de l'État in Liége. They deal for the most part with transfer of property and settlement of incomes. M. Lahaye analyzes 1939 documents, the last of which is dated July 2, 1792. This volume contains an index to the entire work. The first volume which appeared in 1922 has a fitting introduction.

The University of Washington. HENRY S. LUCAS.

Freiheitsgarantien für Person und Eigentum im Mittelalter: eine Studie zur Vorgeschichte moderner Verfassungsgrundrechte. Von Dr. jur. Robert von Keller. [Deutschrechtliche Beiträge.] (Heidelberg, Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1933, pp. 311, 15 M.) This monograph belongs to a series of studies in German law under the editorial direction of Dr. Konrad Beyerle, the author being one of Beyerle's students. Here Keller presents in some detail, with special reference to the subject of individual freedom and property rights, the evidence which supports his master's thesis regarding the necessity of correlating and connecting modern German constitutional theory with its medieval background. In a prefatory statement, Beyerle refers to his part in shaping the Weimar constitution when he urged that the present legal framework should be considered primarily in its historical perspective. Otherwise, he insisted, it cannot be understood in its 'ull force and significance; nor can it fulfill its public protective and supervisory functions.

Keller cites a wide range of materials, including such sources as the Anglo-Saxon Dooms, the Frankish Capitularies, the Spanish Fueros, and particularly numerous *privilegia* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He discusses many different liberties and rights guaranteed by medieval custom and practice as against the arbitrary usurpation of power: freedom from marriage restrictions, and from fees and services to lords, rights of inheritance, liberty of economic movement and free sale of property, the right of asylum in free cities, freedom from the obligation of military service, entertainment and taxation, the right of legal trial and judgment, guarantees against arbitrary arrest, search and seizure (violations of the *Hausfrieden*), duels and other proofs by judgment of God.

For the medievalist this study will have value chiefly as a comprehensive survey of the evolution of the various types of medieval liberties (*Freiheiten*), indicating their development, in some instances, from the earlier customary *paces* (*Frieden*). For historians generally it raises the philosophical problem of evaluating past practices in the light of current political theory.

The Rice Institute. FLOYD SEYWARD LEAR.

Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England: the Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals. Volume VI. By T. F. Tout, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. LXIV.] (Manchester, University Press, 1933, pp. x, 457, 40*s*.) With this volume the famous life work of the late Professor Tout, the separate parts of which have been duly noticed in this *Review* (XXVI. 78; XXXIV. 314; XXXVI. 796), is at length brought to a triumphant conclusion. The chapters having been substantially completed by the master himself, it was left to his efficient collaborators, under the direction of Mrs. Tout, to gather together the final notes, to add the appendixes and compile

the general index. In the Corrigenda and Addenda naturally more corrections appear to have been made by the author himself than any single reviewer could suggest to him, while the running comments of scholars like the late J. H. Round, R. L. Poole, and Charles Johnson lend to the notes a livening touch. A most valuable contribution is the list of officers beginning with the chancellor and the treasurer, and extending down to keepers of the privy seal, keepers and clerks of the various wardrobes, the king's secretary, and others. The index, in the hands of Miss Mabel Mills, over 300 pages, is exceptionally comprehensive, being analytical and topical, with emphasis on administrative headings, proper names, and collective nouns. As a pioneer in the field, Professor Tout never considered the work to be final, but the reviewer predicts that whatever may be the modifications in detail it will be long before any considerable portion is superseded.

J. F. B.

Una compagnia di Calimala ai primi del trecento. Per Armando Sapori. [Biblioteca storica toscana, volume VII.] (Florence, Leo S. Olschki, 1932, pp. 420, 60 l.) This is a work of the first importance to the student of commercial practices in Italy in the early fourteenth century. It is based upon the Del Bene archives and other sources in the *Archivio di Stato* of Florence, as well as the records of the Bardi, the Alberti, and the Peruzzi companies. It traces in detail the customs of the Del Bene Company in purchasing cloth at the northern fairs (*panni franceschi*) and the cost and method of transportation to Florence. Much light is thrown upon some disputed points concerning the marking of goods as prescribed by the Guild of Calimala. This entails an interesting discussion of the meaning of "just price" and "real price". Selling practices at wholesale and retail, the relations of the company with the commune and with the guild, and the methods of keeping commercial accounts, are all set forth at length with a wealth of documentary illustrative material. The appendixes are especially valuable. About one hundred pages of transcriptions from the company records are included, as well as a chart of purchases and sales made from 1318 through 1323, with prices, payments, and other details concerning each transaction.

K. J. G.

Calendar of Select Pleas and Memoranda of the City of London, preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall, A. D. 1381–1412. Edited by A. H. Thomas, M. A. [Printed by order of the Corporation under the Direction of the Library Committee.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. xl, 369, $4.50.) This is the fourth calendar of London judicial documents to appear under the able editorship of Mr. Thomas, Deputy Keeper of the City

Records. In his words, "The present volume, unlike its predecessors, is described as a calendar of *select* pleas and memoranda, because a somewhat larger number of formal entries and records of small debt actions have been omitted." Thus it is made to cover a period of thirty-one years, instead of the seventeen embraced within the scope of volume II. of the *Plea and Memoranda Rolls.* It fully maintains the high standard already set in the publication of the series, concerning the general nature of which Miss Scofield has already given an admirable statement (*Am. Hist. Rev.* XXXV. 832 ff.).

There are three indexes: one of names and places, one of subjects, and one of less usual words. To glance through them is to see what a treasure house these records are for the student of local topography, of genealogy, of social custom, and of linguistics. Occasionally the calendar also throws light on contemporary politics, notably through the letters of Sir John Hawkwood and John of Gaunt. It contains significant data on the use of credit in medieval business and other matters of concern to the economist. But it remains chiefly valuable, of course, to the legal historian. And in this connection the editor provides an excellent introduction on the Law Merchant—a subject which has received the attention of scholars like Gross, Maitland, Mary Bateson, Hubert Hall, and Holdsworth.

As Mr. Thomas points out, it is especially interesting that municipal judges appealed to the *lex mercatoria* as a system of equity supplementing, because of its broader scope, the custom of any one locality—as had long before been done by the prætors of Rome when they first came to apply the theory of the *ius gentium.* In particular, too, the facts that are here brought out concerning the organization of the London courts in the fourteenth century will be found to have direct bearing on several disputed questions in the city's constitutional history. Perhaps some of the amazingly difficult problems raised by the documents in Dr. Martin Weinbaum's recent collection (*London unter Eduard I. und Eduard II.,* Band II., Stuttgart, 1933) can best be solved by following clues supplied in the later records. To anyone who takes up this meritorious project the work of Mr. Thomas should offer many illuminating suggestions.

Cornell University. CARL STEPHENSON.

Letters of the Court of John III., King of Portugal. The Portuguese text, edited with an Introduction by J. D. M. Ford, Ph.D., D.-ès-l., D.Litt., Harvard University, and L. G. Moffatt, Ph.D., Syracuse University. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933, pp. xix, 169, $2.50.) This volume is a companion to the *Letters of John III., King of Portugal,* already reviewed in this journal (XXXVII. 369–370). It presents the contents of the third of the Palha portfolios now in possession of Harvard University. The authors of these 174 letters are John's brother the Infante Luis, John's widow Queen

Catherine, Jaime Duke of Braganza, his son Theodosius, John's brother the Cardinal Infante Henry, and various other important personages of the same court. One letter, omitted by oversight from the earlier volume, is by John himself. The dates range from 1524 to 1562. The recipient was in most cases the same Chancellor Ataide to whom John's letters were directed. The contents are less administrative than in the king's correspondence, and the interest to historians is therefore probably slighter. Petty private businesses, requests, and formulas of courtesy occupy many pages. No. 106 is the only letter that has ever been printed in full before.

The volume is edited with the same scrupulous philological perfection and printed with the same typographical beauty as the 1931 publication, to which the reader is referred for glossary and graphical notes. The introduction outlines briefly the lives of the chief contributors, and calls attention to a few items of interest in the text. There is no index.

The University of California. S. Griswold Morley.

England und die Antike. Herausgegeben von Fritz Saxl. Mit 90 Abbildungen. [Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg, 1930–1931.] (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1932, pp. xii, 304, 18 M.) All of the nine lectures contained in this volume deal with the influence of classical literature and art in England. The first two (Some Aspects of Classical Influence in Mediaeval England, by E. F. Jacob; Der Sinn des Wissens bei Roger Bacon, by Hans Liebeschütz) throw welcome light on medieval English literature. The third lecture (Erasmus in England, by J. A. K. Thomson) devotes considerable attention to the relation between Erasmus and Thomas More, and it contains an excellent exposition of the authorship of *The Praise of Folly* and of *Utopia*. Very friendly to the English is W. F. Schirmer, the author of Chaucer, Shakespeare und die Antike, in which he asserts that England in the year 1400 was "das in Europa führende Land". He rightly acclaims Chaucer as the leading poet of his day, but Shakespeare, on the other hand, has been rather superficially treated by him.

The English theater at the time of King James I. is the subject of a lecture by O. Fischel, while the next is by E. Cassirer, the brilliant author of *Individuum und Kosmos in der Philosophie der Renaissance*. In the present volume he discusses the revival of Platonism in England under the leadership of Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third earl of Shaftesbury. E. Wind has contributed a study entitled Humanitätsidee und heroisiertes Porträt in der englishen Kultur des 18. Jahrhunderts, and E. de Selincourt has presented a lecture on classicism and romanticism in the poetry of Walter Savage Landor. The last lecture is by Sir Richard W. Livingstone, who depicts the extraordinary influence of classical literature in England during the nineteenth century.

The University of Michigan. A. Hyma.

Henry Cromwell. By Robert W. Ramsey, F.S.A., F.R.S.L. (London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1933, pp. viii, 392, 15*s*.) Mr. Robert W. Ramsey whose scholarly and interesting essays on *Cromwell's Family Circle* met with such favorable reception a little while ago, has continued his labors in the same field with an admirable life of Cromwell's greatest descendant. The author has revealed a gift which is as rare as it is to be envied. He is able to incorporate an extraordinary mass of manuscript materials without losing either the interest or the continuity of his narrative. He has drawn, chiefly from Thurloe and the Lansdowne MSS. in the British Museum, a mass of information which he has been able to make into a most entertaining and instructive narrative. There is (so far, at least, as one reviewer knows) nowhere to be found such a vivid and accurate account, so fully documented, of the decline and fall of the Protectorate as fills the last third of this volume. For that—among many other things—all students of the Cromwellian period should be grateful.

What is no less important in this volume is the fact that its adroit use of the original sources makes its characters alive. In it Fleetwood, in particular, comes off badly, but on his own showing. In it the circle about Henry Cromwell, like Henry himself, is as clearly defined as people one would like to have known; and if Henry Cromwell needed a defense—which he did not—this volume is more than adequate. It raises, indeed, one question which has a certain interest in that field of what might have been but what never happened, which seems to concern so many people nowadays, that vague, romantic realm of "If". "If" Henry had been appointed to succeed his father, could the Protectorate have gone on? To that question this study may provide an answer—but what that answer is the reader must judge for himself. One thing is certain; it is that if he reads but a little way into the volume he will not stop till he has finished it, and determined that problem in terms not only of Henry Cromwell but of those whom he would have had to face. For it is in the side lights on the army leaders that there lies an interest and importance which the student of the period will not miss, and which may come as a surprise to the "general reader", if there are any left.

Harvard University. WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

Shorthand Letters of Samuel Pepys. From a volume entitled *S. Pepys' Official Correspondence, 1662–1679.* Transcribed and edited by Edwin Chappell. [These letters are printed by kind permission of the Trustees of the National Maritime Museum.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xv, 104, $2.75.) To the perpetually growing literature relating to Samuel Pepys, Mr. Chappell has added this interesting and extremely well printed little volume of letters transcribed from the shorthand items in a volume which has only lately passed from the hands of the Pepys-Cockerell family. This collection—only a small part of the nine hun-

dred and forty items contained in the original volume—covers the period from September 20, 1664, to March 30, 1665, roughly that of the second Dutch war. They have to do with a variety of subjects, and are directed to a variety of persons; and they are, in effect, almost wholly official or semi-official. Perhaps the most interesting of the series, as the editor points out, is in connection with Mr. Deane's design for a new ship. The remark of Mr. Castle to whom the design was submitted, that its maker "had never built a ship in his life, nor understood a ship", is much the most entertaining observation in the volume. With this volume Mr. Chappell has rendered a service to Pepysiana, and all confirmed devotees of that great and growing cult will thank him for it.

W. C. A.

The Private Correspondence of Sir Benjamin Keene, K.B. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Sir Richard Lodge, LL.D., Litt.D., Emeritus Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh, Honorary Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xxxviii, 548, $7.00.) This correspondence falls between the years 1730 and the date of the death of Keene, 1757. The bulk of the letters are from him to Abraham Castres in the time when Keene was British ambassador at Madrid and Castres was minister at Lisbon. There are a few letters to Keene from such notables as the Duke of Newcastle, Sir Thomas Robinson, and Richard Wall. There are also a few of his letters to his brother, the Bishop of Chester, to Newcastle, and others. But the volume derives a distinctive flavor which makes it almost unique, from the intimate communications sent to Castres. These letters from one diplomatist to another throw little light on the foreign relations of the time, though British interests at the courts to which Keene and Castres were accredited were of first-rate importance throughout the eighteenth century. Sir Richard Lodge thinks "the references to diplomatic problems in the great majority of the letters . . . scanty and jejune". The letters do, however, reveal the writer: the manner of man he was, his methods, his ambitions, his disappointments, his triumphs, the habits of his daily life. Perhaps their chief interest to the historian arises from incidental revelations concerning the circle in which Keene moved, where he was a power with which his colleagues had to reckon. England sent few men abroad on more difficult missions in the eighteenth century, and few acquitted themselves with greater credit.

Most of the letters in this collection are in the possession of Mrs. Ruck Keene, widow of a great-great-great-nephew of the ambassador. A few apposite items are from public collections. Sir Richard Lodge apparently found pleasure in his editorial task, and the results are adequate to the purpose. His introduction is chiefly interesting for its biographical information. In as far as he summarizes Keene's career as a diplomatist he depends chiefly on studies he has previously published.

Duke University. W. T. Laprade.

The French Revolution and Napoleon. By Leo Gershoy, Associate Professor of History, Long Island University. (New York, F. S. Crofts and Company, 1932, pp. xiii, 576, $5.00.) Texts on the French Revolution, either written originally in English or translated from the French, have been coming thick and fast, in the last few years. With the exception of Mathiez's volumes, they are not the result of long years of critical research and meditation on the subject. Professor Gershoy's history is better than most of those we have. It is the work of a gifted and industrious young scholar, but the writing is too often uncritical, even in places where the reading of an existing monograph would have saved the writer a fall. The description of events, not infrequently, is lacking in clearness, and the synthesis, as a whole, would be improved by a longer study of the importance, relatively, of the facts that enter into it and a longer and more sustained attempt to weave the many strands into a coherent whole. The only reason, I presume, why the Napoleonic Period should be included with the Revolution in a book of 534 pages—not too many for the Revolution alone—is that many colleges cover the period in one semester and need a text. There is little, if any justification for such a pedagogical practice, but that is the affair of the publishers. There is nothing novel in Professor Gershoy's synthesis as a whole, except a fuller treatment of the economic side of the Revolution than is found in the other texts, with the exception of Mathiez's. My main criticism of the text—apart from occasional inaccuracies—is the fact that frequently the writer does not see the forest for the trees, and as a result the treatment lacks depth and meaning. The bibliography is full and well chosen, although some very important monographs are missing and some of the bibliographical criticism is not of great value.

F. M. F.

Mémoires du marquis de Toustain, 1790–1823. Publiés par la marquise de Perry de Nieüil. (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1933, pp. ii, 429, 25 fr.) The author of these *Mémoires,* born in 1774, came from an old noble family of Normandy. Like his father, he was educated for a military career and became an officer in the royal army. An *émigré* in 1791, he joined the army of the princes on the Rhine and in the legion of (the Vicomte de) Mirabeau saw considerable service against the forces of the Revolution. The *émigrés,* buffeted about by the Austrians and Germans, were in a difficult position and after the peace with Austria in 1797 he entered the service of Russia. When Paul I. deserted the second coalition, he went to England and from 1801 to 1807 was attached to the staff of the army of Portugal. Returning to France in 1808, he was placed under the surveillance of the police and took no part in public affairs until the Restoration. Upon the return of Napoleon from Elba, he followed the king to Ghent. His loyalty to the Bourbons appears to be genuine and he later received several marks of their favor.

The three manuscript volumes of the *Mémoires* were among the papers of the Marquis de Perry de Nieüil, great-grandson of the author. The account is arranged by years and the space devoted to each varies greatly, but there is a complete gap for the period 1808 to 1813 and for the year 1818. In the published work footnotes have been added by the Vicomte de Gronchy which identify practically all the persons mentioned in the text. Some additional information is included in appendixes. The work is richer in supporting evidence of facts already known than in new material. There is a wealth of concrete detail concerning the attitude of the *émigrés* and the difficulties of their position. But perhaps the greatest contribution of the author lies in the field of military history. While he exaggerates the influence of the *émigrés*, his various connections with forces opposed to the Revolution gave him first-hand knowledge of many events and some important information. He also makes many interesting observations on conditions and persons encountered in the lands of his sojourn. The vast solitude and desolation of Siberia reminded him "au moment où Dieu venait de tirer l'univers du chaos" (p. 153). His opinion of the military ability of Mirabeau Tonneau was not flattering. "Il n'eût connu d'autre manoeuvre que d'aller en avant, la baïonnette au canon et se serait fait tuer de bonne grâce" (p. 16).

The State University of Iowa. GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS.

Modern Italy: a Short History. By George B. McClellan, Professor of Economic History, Emeritus, in Princeton University. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1933, pp. x, 319, $3.00.) Professor McClellan's volume is a sketch of the history of Italy from the French Revolution to the present, with generous space (roughly half the book) for the period since 1870—a scope that answers well to a present popular and scholastic demand. Clear of scholarly pretensions, and intended for the general reader and perhaps for the college student, it is nevertheless a disappointing book. It only skims the surface, without achieving conciseness, and it is written from no consistent point of view. Facts are offered in abundance, particularly the details of military action and of shifting ministries, but they do not hang together, except perhaps with reference to the Fascist movement, with which the author is in full sympathy, and which he presents ably, though solely from the political point of view. Professor McClellan's treatment of the Napoleonic epoch as a phase of the *Risorgimento* is woefully thin and misleading. His account of the national movement from 1815 to 1861 unfortunately perpetuates misconceptions which recent scholarship has dispelled, particularly with regard to the character and rôle of Charles Albert, and it falls into some new ones regarding Mazzini and Cavour. The road the author traces from 1870 to the outbreak of the World War is a tortuous one, full of the loose stones of political detail, on which the most diligent reader is likely to stumble

and lose his way, with no view of the processes by which Italy was being knitted into a nation. Apart from the lack of broad views and depth of information, the book has suffered at the hands of proof readers insufficiently familiar with the Italian language. At the end there is a long list of authors consulted, but it does not include such active modern scholars as Prato, Ciasca, Colombo, Vidal, or Matter.

Professor McClellan is familiar with Italian politics and his judgments of men are vigorous and just. His keen interest in military history has resulted in sharp and helpful accounts of the campaigns and battles of his period.

The Johns Hopkins University. KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

The Beginnings of Marxian Socialism in France. By Samuel Bernstein, Ph.D. (New York, Elliot Publishing Company, 1933, pp. x, 227, $2.00.) This book is a Columbia University doctoral thesis privately published. The author states that the reason for his study is that the subject has been treated only very briefly in French and not at all in English; but it cannot be said that this book fills the gap.

The first half of the book contains a survey of the social movement at Paris from 1860 to 1878, a period when Marxian doctrines were practically unknown in France. This account seems unnecessarily long, since nothing of importance is presented which cannot be found in Professor Mason's *Paris commune* or in Professor Weill's *Histoire du mouvement social en France.* The rest of the book recounts the beginning of the propaganda of modern socialist doctrines by Jules Guesde in 1877–1879, the socialist victory over the coöperators at the Congress of Marseilles in 1879, and the adoption of a Marxian program by the new party in 1880 after a struggle with the moderates and the anarchists. This last half of the book contains a good deal of information not hitherto available in any one place.

Dr. Bernstein has restricted his study too much to the activities of a few Parisian leaders, with the result that even in his last two chapters the amount of important material which cannot be found in the works of Weill and Zévaès does not bulk large. A study of the *syndicats* of this period, whose histories are available in the four volumes published thirty years ago by the *Office du Travail,* would have enabled him to explain more clearly the reasons for the rapid conversion of many *syndicats* to collectivism in 1879. His view that modern socialism entered France very slowly does not seem in accord with the fact that a majority of the militants of the labor movement were won over from coöperative doctrines to collectivism in less than two years. A full explanation of this rapid conversion seems to the present reviewer to be the crux in a study of these years, and Dr. Bernstein touches the problem only lightly. Although it is difficult to estimate the number of workers involved in the social movement of the time, it is not impossible, and a page devoted

to this problem would have aided in placing the movement in its proper setting.

Harvard University. MAXWELL R. KELSO.

Det nordslesvigske spørgsmaal, 1864–1879. Aktstykker og Breve til Belysning af den danske regerings Politik, paa udenrigsministeriets Foranstaltning udgivet af Aage Friis. Bind III., 1871–1877. (Copenhagen, Hendrik Koppel, 1932, pp. 549.) This third volume of documents on Denmark and the North Schleswig question is edited with the same scholarly care and thoroughness that marked the first two. Falling between two periods of diplomatic activity, the documents in the present volume are of less interest than those of the others in the series. The failure of the negotiations of the late eighteen-sixties and the striking success of Prussia in the war with France naturally influenced the policy of the Danish government. From 1871 to 1877, it watched affairs in Germany and Europe with minute care. But except for an occasional confidential *démarche* at St. Petersburg, responsible Danish statesmen carefully avoided any initiative. They feared on the one hand, that Danish overtures to Germany would lead to a renewal of the demand for guarantees in case of cession, which Denmark could not accept; on the other, that evidence of Danish activity might result in the abrogation of that part of Article V. of the Treaty of Prague on which their hopes were based. Probably the most interesting material in the volume from the general European point of view, is the series of discussions concerning the neutralization of Denmark on the Belgian model.

The University of Minnesota. LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

Russland und die Entstehung des Balkanbundes 1912, ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Weltkrieges. Von Dr. Otto Bickel. [Osteuropäische Forschungen.] (Königsberg, Ost-Europa-Verlag, 1933, pp. v, 173, 6 M.) As the title indicates, this volume purports to tell the story of the relation of Russia to the origin of the Balkan alliance of 1912. In reality the work is somewhat broader in scope, and it is perhaps this wider field which gives the greater value to its content. The opening pages give a brief introduction to the nineteenth century attempts to form some sort of Balkan union—attempts which the author considers to be Utopian efforts toward a chimerical union. The next section treats the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the policy of the European powers, though the essential emphasis is given to the Balkan scene itself. Sections III. and IV. trace the development of Russian policy in the Balkans from 1909 to 1911, dealing particularly with the Charykov plan, the conflict of policy within the Russian foreign service, the diplomatic struggle with Austria in the Balkans and the Balkan alliance as "a means of Russian policy for settling the question of the Straits". The

final chapters relate the history of the Balkan alliance of 1912, delineate the position of the European powers with reference to the Balkan situation, and describe the changed situation in the Near East on the eve of the World War. The author points out that the internecine struggle of 1912–1913 represented a defeat for Russia, now threatened more than ever in the region of the Straits.

A brief bibliography and *dramatis personæ* complete the volume. It must be confessed that while the author has produced a substantial and objective monograph on pre-war diplomatic history in the Balkan peninsula, neither in his information nor in his bibliography has he given us anything which is essentially new or unfamiliar.

Miami University. HARRY N. HOWARD.

La condotta economica e gli effetti sociali della guerra italiana. Per Luigi Einaudi. [Economic and Social History of the World War, James T. Shotwell, Ph.D., LL.D., General Editor, Serie Italiana.] (Bari, Gius. Laterza e Figli; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1933, pp. xvi, 444.) Senator Einaudi's contribution to the Economic and Social History of the World War is worthy of its distinguished author. It brings the war in its larger definition down to date, under its double aspect as a military episode and as a continuing influence in the development of modern Italy, and explains why many things are as they are to-day in that country. Its argument is bolstered by figures and percentages, which are not exhibited in tables but form a running text of factual comment and interpretation. Their abundance may be beyond the capacity of most American readers to assimilate without some strain on the attention; but statistics are a minor tragedy of the great conflict. They can be sampled or skipped and serve the broader theme of the book better perhaps as an aid to understanding the social changes that followed the war than as a record of Italy's marshaling of brute matter to meet the impact of brute matter from her enemies.

In fact war measures and achievements, plus a prefatory account of Italy's economic growth between attaining unity and joining the Allies against the Central Powers, occupy but little more than half the volume. Many will regard these three chapters mainly as prolegomena to the author's able analysis of the changes that occurred in the economic and social structure and in the psychology of his nation during the years of violent transformation that followed peace. Such a discussion cannot be summarized intelligibly in a short note. It is a valuable aid to understanding Fascism, and indirectly to comprehending the political mind of contemporary Europe. Moreover it has thought provoking hints for the American of this present year of grace.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

Economic Development in Modern Europe. By Clive Day, Seymour H. Knox Professor of Political Economy, Yale University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xiv, 447, $2.50.)

A History of the Economic Institutions of Modern Europe: an Introduction to Der moderne Kapitalismus of Werner Sombart. By Frederick L. Nussbaum, Professor of History, University of Wyoming. (New York, F. S. Crofts and Company, 1933, pp. xvi, 448, $3.50.) The simultaneous appearance of two books on the economic history of modern Europe is evidence of the growing interest in this subject. Each of them illustrates a different approach to the subject and as a result each complements, rather than competes with, the other. Professor Day attempts, as he writes in his preface, "something approaching the form of constitutional history". His book therefore "aims to present for study the institutions of the two most important branches of production—agriculture and manufacture". Professor Nussbaum has presented the main lines of the synthesis of the economic history of Europe as embodied in the more than three thousand pages of Werner Sombart's *Der moderne Kapitalismus.* Holding, with Sombart, that fundamental institutional changes operate in disregard of political boundaries, Professor Nussbaum studies the "evolution of the modes and institutions of economic action throughout Europe as a whole".

Professor Day traces clearly and with careful handling of multitudinous detail the development of agriculture and manufactures in England, France, Germany, and Russia for the past century and a half. Trade, transportation, and labor are treated only incidentally, while currency and finance are practically omitted. Professor Nussbaum describes in general terms the evolution of capitalism in its various manifestations, such as the transformation of methods of production, of transportation, of marketing, and of business organization. For American readers who are not familiar with Sombart's writings this interpretation of his views will be found especially stimulating.

The University of Illinois. E. L. Bogart.

History of Norwegian Literature. By Theodore Jorgenson, Associate Professor of Norwegian History and Literature in St. Olaf College. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xiii, 559, $5.00.) Much has been written in English about the Eddas and the Sagas of Old Norse times and even more perhaps about the remarkable achievements of Norwegian writers in the last two generations. But to the long intervening period, to the ballads and folk tales, to the romances and the legends, and to the legal monuments of the later Middle Ages almost no attention has been given by writers using the English idiom. The same is true of the literary activities of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and to a lesser extent of the nationalistic movement that began in the second half of the eighteenth. It is the great virtue

of Professor Jorgenson's history that it travels the whole length of the highway and deals with all its turns and deviations with understanding and appreciation. Since in no other country (so far as the reviewer is informed) is literature so thoroughly woven into the general history of the land and the race, the author has quite properly made his treatment historical rather than critical. It is a book which every student of Northern history will find helpful, not only through the light that it casts on the background of his subject but also because it frequently deals directly with sources that belong in his field of research. L. M. L.

Beginning the Twentieth Century: a History of the Generation that made the War. By Joseph Ward Swain, Associate Professor of History, University of Illinois. (New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1933, pp. xi, 631, $4.00.) This opus begins with a world as explained by Darwin and understood by Bismarck and progresses to one which Professor Swain explains according to Spengler, but which he himself scarcely professes to understand. The reaction against the "Century of Hope" colors it, and the imperialism and greed of the 80's and 90's receive understanding, not sympathy. The old diplomatists get justice only, not mercy, as the author unfolds the tale of whither cunning and cupidity led them. Yet, except in a few rare instances, he indicts not the men but the *Zeitgeist* of the generation which prepared the harvest of Armageddon.

The work falls into three nearly equal parts. The first 200 pages trace the domestic history of the European nations and the United States from 1880 to 1914. The next 180 pages are devoted to the international competitions, alliances, events and crises as related to the domestic problems and to the catastrophe which they are preparing. Ten chapters, 210 pages, on The Nemesis of Chauvinism interpret the military, diplomatic, and financial campaigns which bring about the European revolutions of 1917–1918, the Armistice, and the peace treaties, and include a brief account of post-war events to 1932.

The style is warm, clear, and incisive. The footnotes are few but good, and an excellent bibliography is appended. The maps are well executed and well placed.

The criticisms to be made are few. Some exception may be taken to his personal judgments. He excuses for William II. his mistakes as well as his sins of omission, and makes of Sir Edward Grey a self-deceiving sophist. On the other hand he interprets Poincaré and Wilson by their actions with less attempt to read their minds. As to the problem of World War responsibility he is distinctly a "revisionist", despite a feeling that we have gone too far in indictment of France and Russia. Here it is in some degree a work for the specialist rather than for the "average student".

However, the writer paints vivid pictures of national history in the great

European countries. No brief account of the military side of the war has appeared that is better than the sixty-five pages he scatters through chapters XIX.-XXVI. With this is interwoven a clear story of the desperate financial measures resorted to by the combatant nations, and of their diplomatic attempts to secure the adhesion of neutral countries to their respective alignments. Chapters XXII. and XXIII. throw a cold and deservedly unfavorable light on the "propaganda" of both Central Powers and Allies, while his attempt to compress the work of the Peace Conference within the bounds of a twenty-page summary achieves a surprisingly adequate result.

State College of Washington. FRANCIS J. BOWMAN.

The World since 1914. By Walter Consuelo Langsam, Ph.D., Columbia University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xv, 723, $3.00.) This is a detailed factual history. Treaties, constitutions, and other public documents are analyzed at length; the popular vote in major elections is given; figures and percentages show changes in trade and industry. Except in the opening chapters and the brief conclusion, interpretation is reduced to a minimum.

The first third of the volume is devoted to international affairs. The brief sketch of the origins of the war sets forth the "revisionist" point of view. The growth of the war spirit in America is ascribed to three forces: "First, the anti-German activities of such men as Theodore Roosevelt, General Wood, and Secretary of War Garrison, of the National Security League, and of Allied agents; secondly, the violent propaganda methods of German and Austrian agents; and thirdly, the interests of American financiers." Apparently Dr. Langsam believes that both Grey and Wilson thought of the war as an opportunity to eliminate Germany as a commercial rival. In describing the Peace Conference he takes a kindly view of Lloyd George, but of Clemenceau he writes: "His love of France apparently was the only sincere thing about him."

The wisdom of describing international affairs since 1919 before the internal history of the powers is doubtful, because foreign policy has been so completely dominated by domestic politics. Dr. Langsam believes that at least the beginnings of a better world order have been made since 1919. Before the war, he says, "issues and responsibilities were beclouded; confusion and hysteria ruled at the expense of sobriety and sincerity". Since the war "there has been a decided improvement, in the creation of the League of Nations and the World Court, and the popularization of the conference method for the settlement of international problems". In his conclusion he stresses the dangers of "the economic war and the absence of any systematic regulation of production and distribution". It is unfortunate that he does not present any detailed analysis of these economic elements.

In the section on "National Scenes" space is allotted roughly on the basis

of definite political and social change. Thus Turkey, Great Britain, France, and Spain are treated at equal length; Italy, Germany, and Russia receive much more extended consideration. Dr. Langsam obviously feels more sympathy for the Bolshevik, than for the Fascist experiment, while he feels little sympathy for French internal or foreign policy; but on the whole he confines himself to a straightforward chronicling of events.

The bibliography is lengthy, but no attempt is made to estimate the relative value of the works, about a thousand in all, which are listed. The index is good. As is perhaps inevitable in a book on recent history, there are several errors of fact.

Princeton University. R. J. SONTAG.

True Relation of the Hardships suffered by Governor Fernando de Soto and Certain Portuguese Gentlemen during the Discovery of the Province of Florida, now newly set forth by a Gentleman of Elvas. Translated and edited by James Alexander Robertson. Volume I., *Facsimile of the Original Portuguese of 1557.* Volume II., *Translation and Annotations.* [Publications of the Florida State Historical Society, number 11, volumes I. and II.] (De Land, the Society, 1932; 1933, pp. 22, clxxx; xxv, 487, $75.00.) Few books have been produced during the present economic disorder that can match in typography and format these two volumes. They are printed on Crane full linen rag and bound in vellum and cloth with gold lettering. The manuscript facsimile in volume I. is a most uniform and admirable photostatic reproduction. Volume II., designed by Carl Purington Rollins, is printed with special type cloister initials with ten point English Cloister Old Style notes. The whole edition is limited to 360 numbered copies and is the most elaborate issued in any language.

Besides the facsimile, the first volume contains a dedication, a foreword, a preface, in which are mentioned earlier translations of this document, a table of contents, and a list of the members of the society. The second volume contains besides the translation of the manuscript, a preface in which the editor discusses the companions of De Soto and their hardships, collected notes, bibliographical notes, and an admirable index. The section entitled "Bibliographical Notes" discusses the Elvas and other narratives of the De Soto expedition, manuscripts relating to legal controversies following the explorations, the problem of determining the route of De Soto, books about him and about his expedition, and early maps showing the country and his route. For the last, the second volume contains a map of Louisiana and the course of the Mississippi by Guillaume Delisle (Paris, 1718), and a map (the earliest known) showing the nomenclature of the expedition.

There are only three known copies of the account of the Gentleman of Elvas extant to-day. These are in the Biblioteca de Ajuda in Portugal, in the

British Museum, and in the Lenox Collection of the New York Public Library. It is the latter manuscript dated 1557 which has been used in these volumes. Besides making possible the comparison of the translation with the original manuscript, the Florida Historical Society has made available to students a clear readable facsimile of the document which heretofore has been available in only ten copies made from the British Museum manuscript by the Massachusetts Historical Society as No. 117 of its "Americana Series".

Dr. Robertson is no nearer discovering the author of this account than his editorial predecessors, but he suggests that the researcher may eventually learn the identity of the Gentleman of Elvas by "careful research in the great Portuguese archives of Torre do Tombo, and in other manuscript collections". In any case Dr. Robertson concurs in the belief that the manuscript is based upon "field notes" made during the expedition.

The George Washington University. A. CURTIS WILGUS.

The Foundation of American Constitutionalism. By Andrew C. McLaughlin, LL.D., Professor Emeritus of History, University of Chicago. [Anson G. Phelps Lectureship on Early American History, New York University, Stokes Foundation.] (New York, New York University Press, 1933, pp. vii, 176, $3.00.) Professor McLaughlin is unexcelled as a student and expositor of institution-making ideas. The six lectures in the present volume exhibit the continuity between the concepts of New England Congregationalism and those underlying the Federal Constitution. The central concept is that the group of individuals, united through mutual agreement, is, under God, the source of authority.

Beginning with the church covenant the discussion traces the carry-over into the theory that political society is created and government established through compact. Government is thus conceived of as deriving its powers from the consent of the governed; its powers are limited and the exercise of any not granted is illegal; resistance to such usurpation is not rebellion. These ideas were directed against England between 1763 and 1775.

More important than measures of resistance in the Revolutionary era are the constructive operations of this philosophy, which led to the formation of constitutions (social compacts) by means of conventions. From the same ideology sprang the practice of courts in regarding as void acts contrary to the constitutional grants.

The philosophy which is portrayed as so influential in American development is shared, as is shown, with English liberals of the seventeenth century. But under American conditions it enjoyed a unique development; and, through imperial relations before 1763, it was directed toward the federal form of government instituted in 1787.

Despite the emphasis on this one group of ideas, Professor McLaughlin

admits, and indeed emphasizes, the importance of others. He deals with the trading corporation—which, after all, illustrates another aspect of the compact—and mentions the voyage agreement under the old sea law as of probable significance.

The ideas which these lectures present cannot be called novel. Professor McLaughlin has himself discussed several of the topics in previous writings. But they are none too familiar to students of history and law, and the present synthesis should enlighten numerous readers.

The Ohio State University. HOMER C. HOCKETT.

Brigadier-General Louis Le[illegible]gue Duportail, Commandant of Engineers in the Continental Army, 1777–1783. By Elizabeth S. Kite. [Institut Français de Washington.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1933, pp. vii, 296, $2.50.) As the author states in the preface, "this volume is the first of a series, whose object is to give as complete a story as American archives will permit of the French volunteers who came to this country at the beginning of 1777". This is a praiseworthy "object", but limits the program. There were other French volunteers who were in service before 1777 and some who came later who might well be included, as, for example, Armand, Fleury, Du Coudray, Comte de Pontgibaud, and L'Enfant.

The book under review can hardly be considered as a "life" of Duportail, as the account of his career prior and subsequent to his service in the American Revolution is inadequate and poorly organized. The bulk of the book is made up of the letters of Duportail from 1777 to 1783, mostly to and from General Washington. They give a good account of the service of the French volunteers who came with Duportail and especially of their efforts to secure the rank and emoluments to which they felt themselves entitled both because they were trained soldiers who had sacrificed the comforts of home and the protection of their native country to engage in the service of a cause that frequently appeared all but lost and also to secure a standing and an authority, in relation to the native American officers, that would permit them to serve effectively. The letters also detail the efforts to prevent discharge because of congressional indifference or the jealousy of associate American officers. After the break-up of the American army, Duportail returned to France and took an active part in the early events of the French Revolution, but later being proscribed he returned to the United States and settled on a farm near Philadelphia.

For an initial account of a career such as Duportail's, the source material used is too restricted, a limitation that is to be regretted because so little is known of this capable officer. Likewise, because of the sketchy character of the narrative, it is difficult to establish any satisfactory chronology of Duportail's movements. The book is well printed and well bound; the index is

adequate, but somewhat unusual in its arrangement. There is an excellent Peale portrait of Duportail as a frontispiece, but there are no maps.

Great Neck, New York. THOMAS ROBSON HAY.

An Englishman in America, 1785, being the Diary of Joseph Hadfield. Edited and annotated by Douglas S. Robertson. (Toronto, Hunter-Rose Company, 1933, pp. ix, 232, $2.50.) This diary is a welcome addition to the scanty travel literature of the period just after the American Revolution. The writer, a cultured middle-class Englishman, was only twenty-six years old when he was sent to America to superintend the collection of debts due to a Manchester firm with which his father was associated. He tells nothing of his business activities but throws light on social and economic conditions in parts of the United States and Canada. Young Hadfield landed at Yorktown; visited Norfolk, Williamsburg, Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Alexandria; and was entertained by General Washington at Mount Vernon. The account of his Virginia experiences is not in diary form and "was written some time following a second visit to America in 1787". How he got to New York is not told nor is there any account of his experiences or observations in that city. The day-by-day journal begins on June 3, 1785, when the author left New York on a sloop bound for Albany. He traveled from Albany to Fort George by wagon, down the lakes by bateau, and then overland to Montreal. After a few days in Montreal he set out from La Chine with a brigade of fur traders in bateaux and made the trip to Niagara in about two weeks. Along the way he came in contact not only with Indians but also with many of the Loyalists who were settling in Ontario at this time. Returning to Montreal he went down the river to Quebec, returned by land, and then retraced his route to Albany. From there he traveled overland to Boston, where he spent about two weeks, with side trips to near-by places and to Portsmouth. Another week was devoted to Providence, after which the diarist returned by packet to New York. The journal appears to be competently edited, the annotations are adequate, and a brief index is provided.

Western Pennsylvania Historical Survey. SOLON J. BUCK.

A Neglected Period of Connecticut's History, 1818–1850. By Jarvis Means Morse, Ph.D., Brown University. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1933, pp. 359, $3.50.) We have here a painstaking account of that commonwealth during the so-called Middle Period of our national history. Dr. Morse has provided chapters on Connecticut under the new constitution of 1818, on the conservative reaction that follows this outburst of reform, on the rise of the Democratic party and its triumph in 1833, and on the close of the period under consideration with the bewildered Whigs temporarily restored to power. Religion and education, humanitarianism and social reform, as well

as the economic basis of society are likewise well treated in separate chapters. What Dr. Purcell has done in his *Connecticut in Transition* for the years from 1775 to 1818, Dr. Morse has done equally well for the following period which he ends perhaps rather arbitrarily with the year 1850.

The period is one in which immigration plays a rather incidental rôle in the life of the state due, among other reasons, to that hostile local sentiment against foreigners that found expression in early colonial legislation and was still manifested by restrictions on landholding and the suffrage. But emigration shows its effects in the decline of many communities and the appearance of the decayed borough system of government at a time when Great Britain was shaking herself loose from it. As a result the most insignificant of towns was permitted to exert an influence on legislation equal to that of the most flourishing of the incorporated cities—a system still prevailing without much modification—which has made for extreme conservatism in government irrespective of the shifting of political parties. Thus slavery was allowed legally to exist until 1848 and the thirties were characterized by serious anti-Negro riots. Indeed the average Connecticut voter doubtless reëchoed the words of Governor Ellsworth in 1841, "We resemble an industrious, economical, and well regulated family, presenting a republic which secures more good, and avoids more evil, than any other political community of ancient and modern times". In light of this complacency on the part of Connecticut authorities with the established order of things, one wonders if some practical joker did not persuade Brigham Young to apply as he did in 1845 for permission to settle his persecuted Mormon colony within the state?

This study based upon a wide range of materials is well written although probably no manner of ingenuity could make a highly vivacious narrative out of a rehearsal of drab details of year by year activities of the Connecticut legislature of that period.

Lehigh University. LAWRENCE H. GIPSON.

Fanny Kemble. By Leota S. Driver, Ph.D. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1933, pp. viii, 271, $3.00.) This volume, while it may seem a little remote from the interest of the historian, contributes directly to social and cultural history. Fanny Kemble was the child of several generations of stage-folk, and knew intimately many of the great theatrical figures of her time. She herself trod the boards of the English theater during its period of temporary eclipse in the first third of the century. A little later, she renewed interest in the classical drama in the seaboard cities of the United States, and before finally returning to her native country in 1877, helped, by her Shakespeare readings, to break down the resistance of the more strait-laced provincial communities to things theatrical. Her friends, both in England and in the United States, were among the cultivated and humane spirits of the times.

Fanny Kemble has, moreover, a specific contribution to make to American history through her marriage to Pierce Butler, absentee plantation owner of Georgia and Philadelphia. Her abhorrence of slavery, although emotionally biased, and the story of her contacts with it, cast their own light upon the "peculiar institution" itself and upon the anti-slavery movement. Mrs. Kemble's reaction to slavery, in turn, complicated by personal difficulties, made inevitable a divorce from Pierce Butler; and in the chronicle of events leading up to the granting of a decree in 1849, there is much material for reflection on the domestic manners of the Victorians.

Dr. Driver, in telling Fanny Kemble's story, has chosen, seemingly deliberately, to center her book very markedly upon Fanny herself. She has thereby deprived herself of the opportunity of enriching her study by direct use of material with which she might have painted far more vividly the backgrounds in which Fanny moved. This is a loss. Fanny's own voluminous writings are very little drawn upon for direct quotation; this entails not only a loss in vividness, but, because of the awkwardness of the indirect discourse employed, a good deal of confusion as to whether Fanny or Dr. Driver is speaking. The same sort of confusion prevails also in the use Dr. Driver makes of other source material. Details of chronology are not always clear. On the whole, however, the book seems well balanced and is quite readable.

Washington, D. C. PAUL LEWINSON.

Indian Affairs and their Administration, with Special Reference to the Far West, 1849–1860. By Alban W. Hoopes. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932, pp. ix, 264, $2.50.) In what is obviously a doctoral dissertation and replete with the conciseness and exactness of statement that the requirements of such demand, Mr. Alban W. Hoopes has produced a very readable and connected narrative of a little more than a decade of progress of Indian affairs in the Oregon country, Texas, and the territory which the United States acquired by conquest from Mexico under the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. His emphasis throughout is upon government policy and, by way of preparing for the changes—some of them of considerable moment—that the vast increase of territory in the forties rendered incumbent, he has reviewed the development of policy to date; furnished statistics as to the number and distribution of the aborigines before and after; and sketched the history of the Office of Indian Affairs. In the year of the beginning of his main study, that is, 1849, the Department of the Interior was created and the Office of Indian Affairs transferred to it; but the conditions that had placed it originally with the War Department continuing—the army was still in requisition on the frontier—a dual responsibility came into existence that rendered confusion in the management of Indian affairs inevitable and greatly complicated a situation already inherently serious because of three

chief things: (1) the fundamental differences between the American and Spanish conception of native rights; (2) the extraordinarily rapid increase of white settlers; and (3) the political pressure possible from local communities.

Anything like a synopsis of all Mr. Hoopes has had to say would be here utterly impracticable. Suffice it that he has told his story well and, barring a tendency to minor repetitions, has handled his mass of details in a highly acceptable manner. In a brief concluding chapter he has, as far as policy is concerned, summed up his findings and his views, ending with a criticism of the reservation system, which had its inception, as he believes, in the scheme of things outlined for California. With this idea issue might well be taken. His book comprises careful citation of sources and authorities, a useful working bibliography, and a reasonably full index.

Aberdeen, Washington. ANNIE H. ABEL-HENDERSON.

The Foreign Policy of the United States in Relation to Samoa. By George Herbert Ryden, Ph.D., Professor of History and Political Science, University of Delaware. With an Introduction by John Bassett Moore. [Yale Historical Publications Miscellany, XXIV.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1933, pp. viii, 634, $5.00.) The importance of the familiar story of the handling of the problem of Samoa lies, according to Professor Ryden, in the fact that the policy there displayed marked the beginning of American imperialism, and marked also a temporary abandonment of the principle of "no entangling alliances". If the author believes there is a lesson to be drawn from the results of American intervention in the affairs of Samoa, he leaves the explicit pointing of the moral to the introduction by Professor Moore. The book itself is consistently neutral in tone. Where the available evidence makes possible interpretation of motive and purpose, that is given, but the most tempting opportunities to sit in judgment upon statesmen, bureaucrats, consuls four months distant from instructions, or rough and ready naval officers are studiously avoided.

However familiar is the outline of international rivalry over Samoa, and, to a lesser extent, of its significance in the history of the foreign policy of the United States, this book has the value of being the most detailed, most accurate, and most non-partisan treatment of those subjects now available. The critical bibliography shows an exhaustive use of the American manuscript and printed sources. The mass of dispatches and telegrams has been presented with a clarity that provides smooth reading. The German material is the scantiest: the record of the activities of German agents in the islands lacks therefore what might be extenuating circumstances. Samoan opinion, available chiefly through missionary interpretations—that of the French Roman Catholic missionaries would be the more interesting—is not represented to any appreciable extent after the seventies. In fact the book is written without

the type of detail and color which would connect its dispassionate account of events and policy with any particular locality. The index is elaborate and there are useful maps inside the cover. In the earlier chapters there lingers a flavor of the dissertation, in some not very pointed quotations and unnecessary footnotes.

Greater emphasis upon the economic and strategic value of the group would have made more explicable the focusing of the attention of three important maritime powers upon it; and the Pacific-minded reader is apt to lament, perhaps unreasonably, the lack of the comparisons which might have been made with the handling of Fiji and of Hawaii. Incidentally, the date of the annexation of Fiji is given incorrectly on pages 136 and 137, with conclusions drawn therefrom, and the statement in the introduction that "During half a century the United States might have had the Samoan Islands for the asking" runs counter to British documents of 1845 warning the French away from that group.

Goucher College. JEAN INGRAM BROOKES.

Sitting Bull, Champion of the Sioux: a Biography. By Stanley Vestal. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932, pp. xvi, 350, $3.50.) This is the first full length biography of Sitting Bull. Johnson's *Life of Sitting Bull and History of the War of 1890–91* was written immediately after the events which it narrates. McLaughlin's *My Friend the Indian* was written by a man who played a prominent part in the final episodes of Sitting Bull's career and he wrote primarily to defend himself against the accusation of having instigated the murder of the chief. Neither Johnson nor McLaughlin made any systematic attempt to investigate the early life of Sitting Bull although he had, almost from childhood, played a leading rôle among the Sioux. In fact until this book appeared, little information was to be found in print in regard to his earlier exploits. Few white men had any contact with him until he was fifty years of age and even for the period of his greatest achievements almost the only written records are the reports of military commanders who found him a most elusive enemy. Mr. Vestal has surmounted the extraordinary difficulties of research involved in writing such a biography by a systematic questioning of all available living witnesses of the events of Sitting Bull's life and by a careful confronting and comparison of their statements. He acknowledges indebtedness to scores of informants, both white and Indian—most of the latter rejoicing in such picturesque names as Julius Standing Buffalo and Mrs. Cecelia One Bull Brown. He is thoroughly convinced of the trustworthiness of the information thus obtained and he is at pains to convince the reader that: "If the ordinary book historian were half so guarded in his statements as these old Indians, he would have to discard half his work." Nevertheless, with all due allowance for the care with which

the Sioux were accustomed to preserve and transmit the oral records of their wars, the minute detail with which some of the early battles of Sitting Bull are described gives rise to the suspicion that old men's tales and old wives' tales retain some of their well recognized characteristics even among the Sioux.

The book would be more valuable to the reader who is not a specialist in the history of the northern Plains Indians if it contained a more systematic description of the social and political organization of the Sioux and some account of their relation to the other tribes with which they were in contact. Its value would also have been greatly enhanced by the inclusion of adequate maps.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH C. GREEN.

The Hutterian Brethren: a Story of Martyrdom and Loyalty, 1528–1931. By John Horsch. [Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, 2.] (Goshen, Mennonite Historical Society, 1931 [1932], pp. xxi, 168, $2.00.)

Communal Pietism among Early American Moravians. By Jacob John Sessler. [American Religion Series, VIII.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1933, pp. 265, $3.50.)

Amana that was and Amana that is. By Bertha M. H. Shambaugh. (Iowa City, The Historical Society of Iowa, 1932, pp. 502, $3.50.) These books alike illuminate American cultural history. The harassed history of the *Hutterian Brethren,* most energetic branch of genuine Anabaptism, began in the Tirol where Jacob Hutter suffered martyrdom in 1533. Moravian and Hungarian lords protected their highly efficient *Haushaben* rather safely after 1563, but the Turkish and other wars destroyed them and the Counter Reformation added considerably to their martyr list. Their last European refuge in 1770 was in South Russia. The communistic organization, sociological expression of Hutterian faith, was temporarily interrupted by persecution but never voluntarily given up by any larger group. As conscientious objectors they left in 1874 (to 1879), joining the Mennonites, for the Territory of Dakota (S. D.), conscription being introduced in Russia. When in 1918 Canada offered complete freedom from military obligations the majority of the *Bruderhoefe* were moved to Manitoba and Alberta. This is the first comprehensive English history of the Hutterites, oldest active communists in the world.

The *Communal Pietism* of the Moravian Brethren, particularly the communistic Economy, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1741–1761, represents the climax in their achievements inspired by Count Zinzendorf. Essentially an institution comprising "choirs" for work and worship, it functioned as an outpost of Unitas Fratrum, contending in its exalted missionary zeal for the winning of heathen Indians and churchless German settlers. Zinzendorf's

earlier plan of a *civitas Indiana-Germana* had failed. This one worked famously as long as the members remained imbued with the original spirit of piety. But this *militia Christi* was not pacifistic. Their ship, the *Irene*, carried guns. During the French and Indian War they turned Bethlehem into a fortress making it an English refuge. Spangenberg, Moravian leader, advised the Quaker government on Pennsylvania defense measures. These incidents are more fully told from European documents by H. Erbe, *Bethlehem, Pa., (Eine kommunistische Herrnhuter Kolonie des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart, 1929). Students do well in using both studies since the archives of the one supplement the other.

The Amana Community of True Inspiration does not differ in its German background from that of the Hutterites and Moravians although originally it was more definitely mystical. Its residence in Iowa dates from between 1855 and 1866. Slowly the old spiritual steadfastness in faith and communism declined. A gradual reinterpretation finally led to a new society recognizing private ownership. Spiritual and economic affairs were visibly separated into the Amana Church Society and the Amana Society both incorporated in 1932. Mrs. Shambaugh has been the closest witness and student of the group. Part I. of her book literally presents again its history published by her in 1908. Part II. deals with the "Great Change". Combined, this is the classic on the Inspirationists.

The American University. ERNST CORRELL.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

With the issue of January, 1934, the Association takes over the editorial control of the *Historical Outlook*. Mr. W. G. Kimmel has been appointed managing editor, and an editorial board has been selected, of which Dr. Charles A. Beard is chairman. The McKinley Publishing Company will continue to publish the magazine and Dr. Albert E. McKinley will be associated with its management, retaining his title of editor. The magazine will be directed primarily, as heretofore, to the interests of school teachers, but it will be devoted to all the social sciences with a greater measure of consideration to subjects other than history. It will lay greater stress than heretofore on the contents, interpretations, and analyses of the social studies, though it will not neglect problems of methods, devices, teacher aids, and tests. Broadly speaking, the purpose of the Council of the Association in assuming control of the *Historical Outlook* is to provide a continuing agency for the furtherance of those principles which its Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools believes should control the selection and organization of the material of instruction in the social studies. These principles are about to be set forth in the final report of the Commission.

The list of research projects which Dr. Conyers Read, the Executive Secretary, has been compiling from returns made to a questionnaire and letters sent out will be published in a pamphlet and distributed with the April number of the *American Historical Review*.

Two new volumes, published under the terms of the Carnegie Revolving Fund, are *The First Earl of Shaftesbury*, by Louise Fargo Brown, and *Slavery in Mississippi*, by Charles S. Sydnor. A volume on *The Anti-Slavery Impulse*, by Gilbert H. Barnes, is in press. Another volume on *The Mississippi Question*, by Arthur P. Whitaker, has been accepted for publication.

The Beveridge Fund Committee expects that H. C. Perkins's *Northern Editorials on Secession and War, 1861*, will probably be ready for publication in the spring. Besides the *Weld Papers*, already announced in these pages, the committee has in immediate prospect the publication of the papers of R. F. W. Allston, a rice planter and politician of South Carolina. The committee also expects to publish as soon as completed, Instructions of Royal Governments in America, edited by L. W. Labaree; Letters relating to America (*ca.* 1760), from the Duke of Cumberland's Papers at Windsor Castle,

edited by S. M. Pargellis; and Correspondence of Governments of Texas, 1835–1836, edited by W. C. Binkley.

The *Records of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, 1695–1729,* edited by Judge Carroll T. Bond, published under the Littleton-Griswold Fund, has now appeared. The two volumes which are to follow in this series are, as announced here in October, *Selections from the Records of the Mayoralty Court of New York City,* edited by Richard B. Morris, and *Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island,* edited by Dorothy S. Towle.

The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the Association met at Reed College, Portland, on December 28-29. There were sessions dealing with The British Empire, European History, and The American West. The Presidential Address, by Professor Charles E. Chapman, University of California, had as its subject The Graduate Seminar in History.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

The International Committee of Historical Sciences held its seventh meeting at Warsaw on August 20 and 26, at the beginning and close of the Sixth International Congress of Historical Sciences. The delegates of 29 countries were present, the United States being represented by Monsignor George Lacombe of the Catholic University of America, the other delegate, Waldo G. Leland, being unable, for reasons of health, to attend.

Two new countries were admitted to representation in the committee: Ecuador and Indo-China. Amendments to the statutes were made, providing that all non-sovereign countries, such as dominions, colonies, protectorates, etc., should henceforth have two votes instead of one, thus placing them on a voting equality with the fully sovereign states; that hereafter the meetings of the committee should be held at least once in every three years, instead of annually as heretofore; and that legal headquarters, originally fixed at Washington, should now be fixed at Zurich, the residence of the new treasurer.

The meeting of the committee that is held at the time of the quinquennial congress is, by statute, the meeting at which the officers and members of the governing board for the succeeding five years are chosen. The following, nominated by a special committee on nominations appointed at The Hague in 1932, were elected: president, Harold W. V. Temperley, Cambridge, in place of Halvdan Koht, Oslo, ineligible for reëlection; vice presidents: B. Dembinski, Posen, reëlected; Karl Brandi, Göttingen, in place of Alfons Dopsch, Vienna, who declined reëlection; general secretary: Michel Lhéritier, Paris, reëlected; treasurer: Hans Nabholz, Zurich, in place of Waldo G. Leland, Washington, who declined reëlection; governors: Rev. Father H.

Delehaye, Brussels; A. Domanovszki, Budapest; Nicolau d'Olwer, Barcelona; and Vincenzo Ussani, Rome. Messrs. Koht and Leland were elected to the extra-constitutional office of "honorary counsellor of the Bureau".

The next meeting of the committee is to be held in Paris on March 22-24, 1934, while the committee voted to accept the invitation of Switzerland for the Seventh International Congress of Historical Sciences, to be held in 1938.

PERSONAL

Mrs. Helen Tunnicliff Catterall, widow of the late Professor Ralph C. H. Catterall, died in Richmond, on November 10. The daughter of an Illinois judge, she was graduated from Vassar in 1889, studied law in her youth and again after her husband's death, was graduated from the Boston University Law School in 1918, and admitted to the Massachusetts bar. She presently began that work for the Carnegie Institution of Washington by which she is known among historical scholars. Three volumes of her *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro,* covering all reported cases in states south of the Potomac and the Ohio and east of the Mississippi and the Sabine, have been published, a mine of material for the student of slavery as an actual fact, edited with consummate legal learning and discrimination. Her fourth and fifth volumes are left in an advanced state of preparation. With all her mental acuteness and varied learning, she was a lady of modest simplicity and charm.

James Laurence Laughlin, the eminent economist, professor of political economy in the University of Chicago from 1892 until his retirement in 1916, died on November 29 at the age of 83. Among his works which dealt with the field of history as well as of economics were his *History of Bimetallism in the United States* (1886), and, recently, *The Federal Reserve Act: its Origins and Problems* (1933). For forty years he was editor of *The Journal of Political Economy.*

Henry Bond Restarick, first Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Hawaii, died on December 8 at the age of 78. He was president of the Hawaiian Historical Society and a writer on Hawaiian history. He also was the author of *Sun Yat Sen, Liberator of China* (1931).

Percy Stafford Allen, president of Corpus Christi College, one of the foremost students of the Renaissance, died on June 16 at the age of 63. For four years he was professor of history at the Government College at Lahore, and he retained a deep interest in Indian affairs throughout his life. From 1915 to 1924 he was librarian at Merton College. His greatest work was his *Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami,* the first volume of which appeared in 1896, and the eighth in 1932. He wrote on *The Age of Erasmus,* and published *Selections from Erasmus* (1908, 1918) and *Selections from Sir Thomas More* (1924).

John William Fortescue, historian of the British army, died on October 21 at the age of 73. He was librarian at Windsor Castle from 1905 to 1926. His great work was entitled *History of the British Army* and was published in thirteen volumes (in 14) from 1899 to 1930. He edited the *Correspondence of King George III.* (6 vols., 1927–1928). He also wrote brief lives of Wellington and of Marlborough. His autobiography, entitled *Author and Curator* (Blackwood), appeared three days after his death.

Maurice Besnier, professor of Ancient history at the University of Caen, died on March 4 at the age of 59. The fields of study which especially interested him were North Africa and Central Italy. Two of his books were *La Tunisie punique* (1904) and *Les catacombes de Rome* (1909). He gave much attention to the topography of Roman Gaul and to the Roman roads. At the time of his death he was engaged upon a history of the Roman Empire after Marcus Aurelius for the *Histoire générale* edited by Gustav Glotz. The portion completed is to be published.

Alfred De Ridder, the distinguished Belgian archivist and historian, died on May 30 at the age of 68. Practically his whole scholarly life, from 1889 to 1930, was spent in the service of the ministry of foreign affairs. He became *directeur général* in 1918. His most important historical works were *Les origines et les phases de la neutralité belge: L'histoire diplomatique du Traité de 1839* (1920) and *Les projets d'union douanière franco-belge et les puissances européennes, 1836–1843* (1933). He edited *La crise de la neutralité belge en 1848: Le dossier diplomatique* (2 vols., 1928).

Medieval studies have suffered a heavy loss by the death on September 21 of Max Manitius. For more than half a century Manitius, who died in his seventy-sixth year, was publishing articles and monographs on medieval Latin literature, medieval libraries, and the transmission of manuscripts, and on the study of classical Latin authors in the Middle Ages, an article on Prudentius glosses appearing as recently as this spring (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, April). These numerous contributions alone would have entitled their author to a distinguished place among medievalists; but some of them were merely preparatory studies for his monumental *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. Although the vastness of this undertaking prevented Manitius from carrying out his original plan of surveying the whole of medieval Latin literature, the magnificent torso—three volumes (1911–1931) covering the period from the beginning of the sixth to the end of the twelfth century—will for many years to come be an indispensable guide to all serious students of the Middle Ages. M. L. W. L.

Camille Jullian, distinguished historian, professor in the College de France, and member of the French Academy, died on December 12 at the age of 74. Among his many writings the most important was his *Histoire de la Gaule* (8 vols., 1907–1926).

In Reed Hall at Dartmouth College the history seminar room was dedicated on June 18 as the Herbert Darling Foster Memorial Room. It will recall to students who work there what Professor Foster did for their predecessors and for the college during his years of service, from 1897 to 1927. His special interests as a scholar are symbolized by pictures of Calvin and Locke. At the dedication brief addresses were made by his colleagues, Professor Waterman and Professor Lingley.

The widow of the late Ludwig Pastor, author of the *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages,* has lately presented the manuscript of this colossal work to the Vatican Library, where a bronze bust of Pastor by the Vienna sculptor Ambrosi has been unveiled.

In the *Annales de l'Est,* 1933, no. 3, Joseph Laurent gives an interpretation of the work of the late Christian Pfister under the title of *Pfister professeur.* This is followed by two significant letters of Pfister, with comments by André Gain.

Professor A. M. Schlesinger, of Harvard University, on leave for the year, is journeying around the world, having sailed from Vancouver on September 9. In February he is to deliver eight lectures as University Professor in American History at University College, the University of London, on Social Forces in American History. As Visiting Carnegie Lecturer, he is to repeat the course in April at the University of Edinburgh.

Dr. Viola F. Barnes, of Mount Holyoke College, has been promoted to a professorship.

Yale University has this year the following visiting professors in history and fields closely connected: William L. Langer, Harvard Lecturer in European History; Arnold Wolfers, Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, International Relations; Philip Noel Baker, Parliamentary secretary to the secretary of state for foreign affairs, 1929–1931, Lecturer in Government; Peter H. Buck, Bishop Museum Professor in Anthropology.

Arnold J. Toynbee, research professor of International history in the University of London, gave in November six lectures at Northwestern University on The Births and Growths of Civilizations.

Some recent American historical works receive more than usual attention in the current European reviews. In the *Mariner's Mirror* for October Admiral Ballard devotes an article to Professor Baxter's *Introduction of the Ironclad Warship.* Professor Carl Stephenson's *Borough and Town* is reviewed at length by Professor James Tait in the October *English Historical Review* and by Professor F. M. Stenton in the October *History.* In the former journal are reviewed Professor Donnan's *Documents illustrative of the Slave Trade,* Mrs. Catterall's *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the*

Negro, and Dr. Paullin's *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States.* These three works are reviewed in the *Revue historique* for July. The *English Historical Review* discusses seven other American books, including those of Professors H. L. Gray, Emerton, Steefel, and McIlwain. In the *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* for September Marc Bloch reviews Professor and Mrs. Gras's *Economic and Social History of an English Village.* Professor Tenney Frank's *Rome and Italy of the Republic* is the subject of an article by Dr. E. Bickerman in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* for October 8. Oswald H. Wedel's *Austro-German Diplomatic Relations* is reviewed in the *Historische Zeitschrift* for November, and Conyers Read's *Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period,* in *The* [London] *Times Literary Supplement* of November 9. In *History* for October Dr. A. F. Pollard reviews H. L. Gray's *Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation,* and Professor H. H. Bellot, R. F. Nichols's *Franklin Pierce.* In a general review in the same journal Professor L. B. Namier comments on works by the late Professor Van Tyne and by G. H. Guttridge and Dora M. Clark. Professor Sée reviews J. V. Nef's *Rise of the British Coal Industry* in the *Revue historique* for September.

GENERAL

General review: H. E. Salter, *Some Histories of Towns* (History, July [1]); Marc Bloch, *Sur quelques histoires de villages* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.).

The annual address delivered before the Unitarian Historical Society on May 25, 1932, by Professor George L. Burr upon the subject, Liberals and Liberty Four Hundred Years Ago, has been published in the *Proceedings* (1933) of the society.

The Presidential Address of Dr. R. F. Nichols before the Middle States Association of History Teachers on May 6 is published in the *Historical Outlook* for November. The subject is History Teaching in this Intellectual Crisis.

Charles K. Webster's Inaugural Lecture as Stevenson Professor of International History at the University of London was published in the July number of *History.* The subject was The Study of International History, and its purpose was to illustrate the practical problems which confront the investigator of international relations. One of these is the material in archives, its accessibility and value. Professor Webster incidentally remarked that the French manifest even now considerable reluctance in opening their archives and declined to let him see papers at the Quai d'Orsay belonging to the years 1834 and 1835. Because the lecture deals with such practical questions it

[1] Articles mentioned in this and the following sections have appeared within the year 1933. Books mentioned were published in that year unless another date is given.

will be read with unusual interest. In his opening passages Professor Webster commented upon the term International History, which is new and yet quite descriptive of the selection of topics the founder of the chair wished to emphasize.

Professor Rafael Altamira, of the University of Madrid, has collected for a French edition all that he has written for nearly a half century upon the questions suggested by the title *Problèmes modernes d'enseignement en vue de la conciliation entre les peuples et de la paix morale* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1932, pp. xi, 282, 40 fr.). In the first part he deals with general questions of education, and in the second with the teaching of history and with war as a historical fact. He believes that education properly directed is a vital influence in freeing peoples from the rule of violence, and that the scientific historian cannot be indifferent to this influence or fail to utilize it in presenting the results of his researches.

Sir Harry Luke's *In the Margin of History* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, pp. xiv, 270, $3.75) is mainly for those who like a good story a little better because it is true. The author has been everywhere and adds touches of personal experience or observation for the places which he sketches or which furnish the setting to his descriptions. One of the most interesting chapters deals with the character who appears in Béranger's line "Il était un roi d'Yvetot" and whose sovereignty lasted from 1392 to 1555. Another entitled Freaks of Freedom describes a series of miniature states, San Marino, Andorra, Monaco, and the Vatican City.

Certain abridgments of sovereignty in consequence of acquired rights or of the interests of neighboring countries protected by treaty are dealt with by Helen Dwight Reid in *International Servitudes in Law and Practice* (University of Chicago Press, 1932, pp. xxii, 254, $3.00). Three chapters are devoted to "Fishery Servitudes", especially in Newfoundland. The consequences of the peace treaties of 1919 are illustrated in the sections on fluvial rights, Danzig, and the Polish Corridor. The work is based upon researches here and abroad. Dr. James Brown Scott has written a foreword.

A book full of critical suggestions, as well as information, for the historical student who must use files of newspapers is *Grundbegriffe des Zeitungswesens,* by Hans Traub (Stuttgart, C. E. Poeschel, pp. vi, 184).

The Deutsches Institut für Zeitungskunde has issued a *Standortskatalog wichtiger Zeitungsbestände,* a useful guide to the collections of newspapers in the German libraries. It is published by Karl W. Hiersemann, of Leipzig (pp. xxxi, 254, 58 M.).

A dictionary of names, more difficult to pronounce, or to spell, if one desires to use the official form, is furnished by the *International Book of*

Names (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell, pp. xliv, 308, $2.00), by C. O. Sylvester Mawson, Litt.D., Ph.D.

Among recent additions to the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law are: *Fundamental Law and the American Revolution, 1760–1776,* by Charles F. Mullett; *The Election of 1868, the Democratic Effort to regain Control,* by Charles H. Coleman; *The Transition in English Historical Writing, 1760–1830,* by Thomas Preston Peardon; *The Concordat of 1801,* by Henry H. Walsh; *French Royalist Doctrines since the Revolution,* by Charlotte T. Muret; and *The Jews and Minority Rights,* by Oscar J. Janowsky.

A committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution is preparing a bibliography of American history based on Miss Grace G. Griffin's *Writings on American History,* and is anxious to obtain three copies each of the volumes for 1907 and 1908. Persons willing to dispose of such copies may communicate with Miss Jean Stephenson, The Conard, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Howard R. Eliason, librarian of the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C., desires to locate a letter written by Abbott Lawrence to Daniel Webster, under date of May 7, 1828, in regard to the tariff bill then pending in the Senate.

Mrs. Jeannette P. Nichols, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., who is collecting material for a biography of Senator John Sherman of Ohio, would be glad to learn the location of any letters to, from, or concerning him or his family. It is desired to obtain the loan of any such letters or photostatic copies of them.

Articles: Henri Massis, *Difficultés de l'histoire* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); Harold Peake, *The Origin and Early Spread of Iron Working* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); Joseph Schafer, *Social Prognosis* (Wisconsin Mag. of Hist., Sept.); Philip C. Jessup and Francis Deák, *The Early Development of the Law of Contraband of War* [III.] (Pol. Sci. Quar., Sept.); G. L. Bratianu, *Servage de la glèbe et régime fiscal: Essai d'histoire comparée romaine, slave et byzantine* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); Richard Koebner, *Zur Begriffsbildung der Kulturgeschichte: I., Kulturform und Kulturbewebung, Jan Huizinga und Jacob Burckhardt* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov.).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The Old Stone Age: a Study of Palaeolithic Times, by M. C. Burkitt, M.A., F.S.A., F.G.S. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, pp. xiv, 254, $2.50), is limited in point of time to the first (oldest) major division of the Stone Age. The regional or geographic limits of the work are confined to Europe and the neighboring countries. The origin of man is placed far back in the Tertiary Period. Man as a tool-user and tool-maker

emerged at least as early as the last phase of the Tertiary Period, known as the Pliocene Epoch. These tools are properly called eoliths and represent the dawn of the Stone Age. The French nomenclature for the various epochs of the Old Stone Age is accepted as valid for Western Europe. Considerable space is given to the subject of cave art and its underlying motives. All the possible motive theories are grouped under three headings: decoration, self-expression, sympathetic magic. The decoration and self-expression theories are ruled out as untenable. Sympathetic magic is considered a reasonable explanation of the cave art problem. G. G. M.

The following reports of excavations and of new discoveries are of interest: A preliminary report on excavations at Tepe Gujan near Nehavend, by G. Contenau and R. Ghirshman (*Syria,* XIV., no. 1); Discoveries in the Athenian Agora, by T. L. Shear (*Antiquity,* Sept.); News items from Athens, by E. P. Blegen, and News items from Rome, by A. W. Van Buren (*Am. Jour. Arch.,* Sept.). Discussions closely connected with recent discoveries will be found in E. A. Speiser's article on The Ethnic Background of the Early Civilizations in the Near East (*ibid.*); that of F. M. T. Böhl on the History and Religion of Israel in the Light of Babylonian Discoveries (*Jour. Bibl. Lit.,* Sept.); and that of S. Casson on A Greek Settlement in Thrace (*Antiquity,* Sept.). Masada, Die Burg des Herodes und die römischen Lager (*Zeitsch. Deutsch. Pal.-Vereins,* LVI., nos. 1–3) is a notable study by A. Schulten of the site and remains of the famous fortress.

The translation of Professor A. M. Andreades's important work (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXIV. 150) under the title of *A History of Greek Finance* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, pp. xix, 412, $6.00) will be welcomed by students of Greek financial history. The translator is Carroll N. Brown, associate professor of classical languages, College of the City of New York. German and French (in progress) translations are evidence of the work's reputation abroad. Although the words "Revised and Enlarged Edition" appear on the title-page, the work is substantially a translation of that which appeared in 1928. An attempt has been made to correct the spelling of non-Greek names (we still find Hormerod for Ormerod, and Westerman for Westermann), and there are scattered references to books and articles which have appeared since the publication of the Greek edition, or have been brought to the attention of the author. Unfortunately the revision has not been at all systematic, and the great majority of recent books and articles bearing directly or indirectly upon Greek public finance, many of which are exceedingly important, have gone unnoticed. Another serious lack is the absence of the bibliographical index, which alone made it possible for the reader to discover which of an author's several books or articles is cited. Possibly this index has been reserved for the second volume, as in the German edition. Except for a few errors, mostly typographical, the English version is

quite adequate. In citing the Berlin corpus, *Inscriptiones Graecae,* however, it consistently uses an abbreviation *C. I. G.,* which is employed solely for a quite separate collection of inscriptions, Boeckh's *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum.* A. B. W.

A History of Olynthus (Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology, no. 17), by Mabel Gude, is a short monograph on the history of the city written in connection with Professor Robinson's publication of his discoveries. The author has followed the views of Mr. Mylonas on the early history of the city. In connection with its later history she believes that there was a synœcism of Chalcidic villages about 432 B. C., followed by the development of the Chalcidic League before 382 B. C. With this view Professor Robinson does not agree. The question seems to turn upon the possibility of a precise definition of the meaning of the coin legends. The author has appended a useful prosopographia, and a collection of the ancient texts, literary and epigraphical, which are important for her subject.

W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson have published *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Sardis* as Volume VII., Part I., of the publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis. There are 231 documents of which 106 have been published before. Of these six now appear in more complete form, and twenty-five are based on fresh copies. The proportion of unpublished inscriptions is therefore quite large. The texts are accompanied by descriptions, translations, and a concise but meaty commentary. The care and thoroughness of the authors are everywhere evident. The prizes in the collection are undoubtedly No. 1, the temple mortgage on the estate of Mnesimachus, No. 4, the decree in honor of Timarchus, No. 8, the documents associated with the career of the *ecdicus* Menogenes, and No. 18, the declaration of the union of building artisans, but there are besides many documents of value to students of the municipal government, cults, and economic life of western Asia Minor. It is good to have all the inscriptions of Sardis gathered into one volume with so clear a format as this, with such full references to comparative materials, and such complete indexes.

Marcus Agrippa: a Biography (Geneva, New York, W. F. Humphrey Press), by Meyer Reinhold, is an intelligent and thorough discussion of many aspects of the career of Marcus Agrippa. The author has attempted to include every piece of evidence which bears upon the life of Agrippa, to fix the chronology of his life as closely as possible, and to trace the influence of Agrippa upon Augustus and upon the foundation of the Roman empire. The collection and evaluation of evidence from a wide variety of literary, archæological, and numismatical sources appears to have been well done, and the discussion reveals powers of analysis and of judgment. One wonders what part Agrippa had in the reorganization of Galatia after the death of

Amyntas. The suggestion that his influence restrained Augustus from pursuing expansionist policies is interesting and has some plausibility even granting that the need of years of rest and reconstruction after Actium must have been evident to all.

Articles: V. Gordon Childe, *Races, Peoples and Cultures in Prehistoric Europe* (History, Oct.); André Bellessort, *Les cavernes de préhistoire* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Sept.); V. Ehrenberg, *Der Damos in archaïschen Sparta* (Hermes, LXVIII., no. 3); F. Stähelin, *Der solonische Rat der Vierhundert* (*ibid.*); J. A. O. Larsen, *The Constitution of the Peloponnesian League* (Class. Philol., Oct.); W. Schwahn, *Die attische Eisphora* (Rhein. Mus., LXXXII., no. 3); F. Schehl, *Zum korinthischen Bund vom Jahre 338/7 v. Chr.* (Jahreshefte, 1932); M. Segre, *Kretikos Polemos* (Riv. Filol., Sept.); G. de Sanctis, *Le origine dell'ordinamento centuriato* (*ibid.*); J. Lengle, *Die staatsrechtliche Form der Klage gegen Rabirius* (Hermes, LXVIII., no. 3); M. P. Charlesworth, *Some Fragments of the Propaganda of Mark Antony* (Class. Quar., Oct.); R. Syme, *M. Vinicius* (*ibid.*); K. Scott, *The Political Propaganda of 44–30 B. C.* (Mem. Am. Acad., 1933); J. Carcopino, *Note complémentaire sur les Numeri syriens de la Numidie romaine* (Syria, XIV., no. 1); W. Seston, *Les vétérans sans diplômes des légions romaines* (Rev. Philol., Oct.); M. P. Charlesworth, *The Tradition about Caligula* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV., no. 2).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Thirty-sixth Critical Bibliography of the History and Philosophy of Science and of the History of Civilization (to October, 1932), listing 675 items, is published in *Isis* for June. *Isis* for September contains the Thirty-seventh Bibliography (to December, 1932), noting some 590 items. Dr. Sarton announces that the devaluation of the dollar forces the editor to reduce the size of this journal, which has contributed so much to the scholarship of many fields.

A plea for the stability of historical currency was made by Mr. G. G. Coulton in the Raleigh Lecture on History for 1932 (*Some Problems in Medieval Historiography*, Oxford University Press, pp. 38, 70 cents). Inaccuracies of fact he feels are tolerated by historians as they would not be by scientists (Montalembert's for example). Second only to accuracy with the historian, should be the use of what Mr. Coulton calls "penetrative force". By this he means that the historian should press into the heart of things as did Gibbon; he should not merely stand aloof. "The historian's duty is either to favour one of the two conflicting sides, or else to confess, after an honest struggle, that he sees nothing to choose between them." The controversy which results from this should not be opposed entirely, but regulated so that its benefits are realized and its evils eliminated. This might be done,

in part, by the British Academy through the use of an arbiter, or of a small commission for investigation into a hotly disputed subject. E. D. S.

The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century: a Study of their Relations during the Years 1198–1254, based on the Papal Letters and the Conciliar Decrees of the Period, by Solomon Grayzel (Philadelphia, Dropsie College, pp. ix, 377, $3.00), is a doctoral dissertation and also part of a project of Dropsie College for a series of historical source books on the relation of Jew and non-Jew. Three-fourths of the book is taken up with documents bearing on the official relation of the Church and the Jews—133 papal letters and 42 conciliar decrees, given in the Latin and in translation. The other fourth of the book is a discussion of the subject. Perhaps because of the topical organization, or perhaps because this study covers too short a period to give a contrast with better times, the work fails to emphasize the decline in the status of the Jews in the thirteenth century. E. D. S.

The third section of Erganzungs-Band XII. of the *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* is devoted entirely to the Middle Ages. Wolfram von den Steinen analyzes critically, and at length, the sources for the conversion of Clovis; Das Rommersdorfer Briefbuch des 13. Jahrhunderts is discussed by Friedrich Kempf; and Karl Beer contributes an article of over 100 pages, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Reformation Kaiser Sigmunds.

The first three issues, for 1933, of vol. XLV. of the *Revue bénédictine* contain important contributions of André Wilmart. The January number has his Nouvelles de Rome au temps d'Alexandre III., to the April issue he contributes La composition de la petite chronique de Marseille jusqu'au début du XIII[e] siècle, and the July number contains his L'admonition de Jonas [bishop of Orléans, 825–843] au roi Pépin [king of Aquitaine] et le florilège canonique d'Orléans, his Opuscules choisis de Hugues de Saint-Victor, and Grands poèmes inédites de Bernard le Clunisien.

Articles: Floyd S. Lear, *The Mediaeval Attitude toward History* (Rice Inst. Pamphlet, Apr.); Goeffrey Barraclough, *The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages: the Part of the Pope in Law and Fact* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Oct.); E. Champeaux, *Jus sanguinis: Trois façons de calculer la parenté au Moyen Age* (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., Apr.); R. Aubenas, *Le contrat d' "affrairamentum" dans le droit provençal du Moyen Age* (*ibid.*, July); Helmut Weigel, *Studien zur Eingliederung Ostfrankens in das merowingisch-karolingische Reich* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Nov.); Max Buchner, *Rom oder Reims die Heimat des Constitutum Constantini?* (Hist. Jahrb., LIII., no. 2); T. Klauser, *Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischen und der fränkisch-deutschen Kirche vom achten bis zum elften Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*); Léonce Auzias, *Les relations de Bernard Plantevelue avec les Princes Caro-*

lingiens (Moyen Age, Jan.); Ferdinand Lot, *Le serment de fidélité à l'époque franque* (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., July); Lester K. Born, *The Specula Principis of the Carolingian Renaissance* (*ibid.*); Paul Deschamps, *Deux positions stratégiques des Croisés à l'est du Jourdain: Ahamant et El-Habis* (Rev. Hist., July); Hilmar C. Krueger, *The Routine of Commerce between Genoa and Northwest Africa during the late Twelfth Century* (Mariner's Mirror, Oct.); E. Sayous, *Les valeurs nominatives et leur trafic à Gênes pendant le XIII^e siècle d'après des documents inédits de ses Archives nationales* (Bull. Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres, Comptes-Rendus, Apr.); F. Bliemetzrieder, *L'œuvre d'Anselme de Laon et la littérature théologique contemporaine: I., Honorius d'Autun* (Recherch. de Théol. Anc. et Méd., July); D. O. Lottin, *Le problème de l' Ignorantia iuris de Gratien à saint Thomas d'Aquin* (*ibid.*, Oct.); J. Koch, *Der Prozess gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte, 1312–1321* (*ibid.*); E. Martin, *Conrad-Probus des Frères-Mineurs, évêque de Toul* (Études Francis., Sept.); J. De Smet, *L'effectif des milices brugeoises et la population de la ville en 1340* (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., July); Thomas P. Oakley, *The Origins of Irish Penitential Discipline* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Oct.); *Id., Cultural Affiliations of Early Ireland in the Penitentials* (Speculum, Oct.); André Boutemy, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Speculum Stultorum* (*ibid.*); I. H. Stein, *An Unpublished Fragment of Wyclif's Confessio* (*ibid.*); George Vernadsky, *The Heresy of the Judaizers and the Policies of Ivan III. of Moscow* (*ibid.*); A. Vaillant and M. Lascaris, *La date de la conversion des Bulgares* (Rev. Études Slaves, XIII., nos. 1, 2); A. Vasiliev, *Justin I. (518–527) and Abyssinia* (Byzantion, 1933, no. 1); V. Laurent, *La généalogie des premiers Paléologues* (*ibid.*); Günther Franz, *Der Kampf um das "alte Recht" in der Schweiz im ausgehenden Mittelalter* (Vierteljahr. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch., XXVI., no. 2).

G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: Ralph Haswell Lutz, *Studies of World War Propaganda, 1914–33* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.).

Mr. C. R. Fay's *Life and Labour in the Nineteenth Century*, originally published in 1920, has appeared in a new edition (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, pp. viii, 308, $1.65). The volume is based on lectures delivered at Cambridge University after the close of the World War to classes in economics, made up in part of students from the American army.

The volume by E. Schram von Thadden on *Griechenland und die Grossen Mächte, 1913–1923* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Rupprecht, pp. 136, 6 M.) [Abhandlungen aus dem Seminar für Völkerrecht und Diplomatie an der Universität Göttingen] is a sketchy summary of the period involving Greece's

part in the Balkan wars of 1912–1913, her entry into the World War, the Greco-Turkish war, and the final *dénouement* in the treaty of Lausanne (1923). It is doubtless inevitable that in such a short volume the treatment of various aspects of the problem should be quite inadequate. Of the six chapters involved fully four of them are devoted to the World War and its ramifications. The final two purport to treat of the period after 1918, crowded as it was with abortive peace, war, and all the human tragedy of the Near East. The treatment follows the books of Cosmin, Frangulis, and Driault, and a host of other well-known works and documentary publications. The author appears to have neglected the diary of David Hunter Miller and the great six volume documentary source published by the French government on the Conference of Lausanne. H. N. H.

In *Fifty Years of Europe* (London, Cassell, pp. 436, 21*s*.) J. A. Spender, the well-known journalist, gives his interpretation of the men and the policies responsible for the World War.

A comprehensive and critical history of the Paris Peace Conference has been written by Dr. Wilhelm Ziegler under the title of *Versailles, die Geschichte eines missglückten Friedens* (Hamburg, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, pp. 271, 5.50 M.). The policy of the American delegation is examined with especial care, and the rôle of Colonel House characterized as distinctly Francophile.

Articles: G. Weise, *Der doppelte Begriff der Renaissance* (Deutsche Vierteljahr. f. Literaturwissen. und Geistesgesch., XI., no. 4); H. W. Eppelsheimer, *Das Renaissance-Problem* (*ibid.*); George H. Kimble, *Portuguese Policy and its Influence on Fifteenth Century Cartography* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); John Horsch, *The Struggle between Zwingli and the Swiss Brethren in Zurich* (Mennonite Quar. Rev., July); Johann Loserth, *Anabaptists in Styria in 1528* (*ibid.*); Émile Duvernoy, *Recherches sur le Traité de Nuremberg de 1542* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 3); Karl Sternberg, *Ueber Campellas "Sonnenstaat"* (Hist. Zeitsch., Aug.); J. E. Swain, *The Occupation of Algiers in 1830: a Study in Anglo-French Diplomacy* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Sept.); Eugene Staley, *Business and Politics in the Persian Gulf: the Story of the Wönckhaus Firm* (*ibid.*); G. B. Henderson, *The Seymour Conversations, 1853* [Historical Revision, LXVII.] (History, Oct.); Harold Temperley, *Stratford de Redcliffe and the Origins of the Crimean War* [I.] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); Hans Herzfeld, *Die Liman-Krise und die Politik der Grossmächte in der Jahreswende, 1913–1914* [I.-II.] (Berl. Monatsh., Sept., Oct.); Albert Pingaud, *L'intervention bulgare dans la Grande Guerre, mai-octobre, 1915* (Rev. France, Oct. 1); Harold Nicolson, *Friedensmacher, 1919: Wilsonismus* (Neue Rundschau, Oct.); David Wolkowitsch, *Sur la crise des transports maritimes* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); R. Musset, *Les causes et les origines de la crise mondiale du blé* (*ibid.*).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The Pipe Roll Society has published as Pipe Roll 45 *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the First Year of the Reign of King John, Michaelmas, 1199,* edited by Mrs. Doris M. Stenton.

Among recent publications by H. M. Stationery Office are: *Calendar of Fine Rolls,* vol. XIII., covering the years 1405–1413, and *Calendar of Treasury Books,* vol. XII., April-September, 1697, edited by William A. Shaw.

Some recent notable studies in local English history are *Bucklebury, a Berkshire Parish,* by Arthur L. Humphreys (privately printed, York Lodge, Reading, 63*s.*); *A History of the Manor and Parish of Iver,* by the late W. H. Ward and K. S. Block (Martin Secker, 10*s.* 6*d.*); *Ecklington, the Story of a Worcestershire Parish,* by A. W. Fletcher (Oxford, University Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*); and *A History of Standish, Gloucestershire* (Standish, The Vicarage, 10*s.* 6*d.*). The first includes many documents, either printed in full or in summary.

Beverly Borough Records, 1575–1821, has been published by the Yorkshire Record Society. The records previous to 1589 are already in print, except for a set running from 1575 to 1583, recently discovered. The editor is J. Dennett.

Dr. Marguerite Wood's edition of the *Flodden Papers: Diplomatic Correspondence between the Courts of France and Scotland, 1507–1517,* has been published by the Scottish Historical Society.

G. B. Harrison's *A Last Elizabethan Journal* (Constable), covering the years 1599–1603, is compiled in the same manner as his previous works relating to earlier years in the reign.

The Hakluyt Society has published, under the title of *Bombay in the Days of Queen Anne,* the account of the settlement written by John Burnell, as well as Burnell's narrative of his adventures in Bengal. The introduction to the first is by Samuel T. Sheppard, and to the second by Sir William Foster, with notes by Sir Evan Cotton and L. M. Anstey. The volume is No. 72 of the second series.

Simon van der Stel's Journal of his Expedition to Namaqualand, 1685–1686 (Dublin, Hodges, Figgis, and Company; New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1932, pp. xxviii, 183, 44 plates, 25*s.*), edited by Gilbert Waterhouse, professor of German in the University of Dublin, is an important document in the history of Dutch South Africa. The manuscript of the journal was supposed to be lost, although a text, differing in detail, had been published by François Valentijn in 1726. In 1922, Dr. Waterhouse discovered it in the library of Trinity College. His edition consists of the original line for line, followed by a translation. The plates reproduce the remarkable

drawings of animals, birds, and plants. At the time the journal was written Van der Stel was "commander" at the Cape, and he was the leader of the expedition to the "Copper Mountains".

Studies in the History of Ophthalmology in England prior to 1800, by R. Rutson James (Cambridge University Press), is an important addition to the growing literature on the history of medical science.

The Foreign Office, by Sir John Tilley and Stephen Gaselee (Putnams), is an effort to trace the various stages in the development of the office since 1782. One of the authors had thirty years of experience in the office, and the other has been its librarian since the World War. Consequently they write with an intimate knowledge of their subject.

An important stage in the development of New Zealand is described in *The Provincial System of Government in New Zealand, 1852–1876* (Longmans, Green, and Company, 1932, pp. x, 293, $4.00), by W. P. Morrell, reader in history in the University of London. The treatment is historical in character and begins with the original "six colonies". Such a mode of separate settlements was dictated by the topography of the islands. They were, however, too small ever to become true provinces, and as soon as difficulties of communication were overcome and the Maori question was settled, their rôle was at an end. The volume is No. 7 of the series known as Imperial Studies, edited by Professor A. P. Newton.

The second volume of *The Milner Papers, 1899–1905* (Cassell, 30*s.*), edited by Cecil Headlam, as the dates indicate, covers the crisis of the Boer War.

Esmé Wingfield-Stratford's *Victorian Aftermath, 1901–1914* (Routledge) is the third of a series of stimulating books on aspects of the history of England in the period indicated. The two preceding were *The Victorian Tragedy* and *The Victorian Sunset.*

Articles: R. V. Lennard, *The Character of the Anglo-Saxon Conquests: a Disputed Point* (History, Oct.); Kathleen Major, *The 'Familia' of Archbishop Stephen Langton* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); F. M. Powicke, *Bibliographical Note on Recent Work upon Stephen Langton* (*ibid.*); N. Denholm Young, *Documents on the Barons' Wars* (*ibid.*); M. V. Clarke, *The Manuscripts of the Irish 'Modus Tenendi Parliamentum'* (*ibid.*); J. H. Clapham, *A Thirteenth-Century Market Town: Linton, Cambs.* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV., no. 2); E. E. Rich, *The Mayors of the Staples* (*ibid.*); Margarete Rösler, *Die Lebensweise der Ausländer in England im späteren Mittelalter und in der Renaissance* (Eng. Studien, LXVIII., no. 1); Conyers Read, *Queen Elizabeth's Seizure of the Duke of Alva's Pay-Ships* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.); M. M. Knappen, *The Early Puritanism of Lancelot Andrews* (Church Hist.,

June); George Williamson, *The Restoration Revolt against Enthusiasm* (Stud. in Philol., Oct.); Robert M. Lees, *The Constitutional Importance of the "Commissioners for Wool" of 1689* [II.] (Economica, Aug.); Curtis Nettels, *Markets in the Old Colonial System* (New Eng. Quar., Sept.); C. R. Fay, *Locke versus Lowndes* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV., no. 2); Dorothy H. Somerville, *The Dates in the Vernon Correspondence* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); R. W. Greaves, *'A Scheme for the Counties'* (*ibid.*); Max Silberschmidt, *Das britische Reich und die Abolition des Sklavenhandels* (Arch. f. Kulturgesch., XXIV., no. 1); John A. Rupert-Jones, *King's Ships built on the North-East Coast of England* (Notes and Queries, July 22, 29, Aug. 5, 19, Sept. 16, Oct. 14); Donald W. Gilbert, *The Economic Effect of the Gold Discoveries upon South Africa* (Quar. Jour. Ec., Aug.); T. R. Adam, *Australian Developments of the Rule of Law* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Sept.); Dietrich Gerhard, *Hauptprobleme einer Geschichte des britischen Empire* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov.); Harold Temperley, *British Policy towards Parliamentary Rule and Constitutionalism in Turkey, 1830–1914* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV., no. 2).

Documents: *Some Letters of Admiral The Hon. Samuel Barrington* [II.] (Mariner's Mirror, Oct.); Holden Furber, ed., *The East India Directors in 1784* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.).

FRANCE

General review: Jacques Godechot, R. Durand, *et al., Bibliographie des travaux relatifs à l'histoire de la Révolution* (Rev. Hist. Mod., May).

A study in the best traditions of the French geographical school is Émile Linckenheld's *Les limites de la Belgica et de la Germania en Lorraine: Étude de la plus ancienne frontière orientale de la Lorraine* (Nancy, Humblot). To reach his conclusions the author has utilized all the resources to be found in the fields of history, epigraphy, and folklore, as well as of topography and geology.

Jehanne d'Orliac in her book *Yolande d'Anjou, la reine des quatre royaumes* (Paris, Plon, pp. 253, 13 fr. 50) emphasizes the part Yolande played in France from 1417 to 1440 as ruler of Anjou after the death of her husband. She is represented as the national leader of the time, controlling the destinies of the nation, and again and again saving her son-in-law, Charles VII., from his dangerous and unpatriotic friends. It was Yolande, according to the author, who "discovered" and used Joan of Arc until the siege of Orleans had been raised and Charles had been crowned, who controlled the king through Agnes Sorel, and who had Jacques Coeur as her special protégé. In this account much space is used in repetitious praises of the qualities of Yolande d'Anjou and little for the significant forces of the time. E. D. S.

Paul Harsin, the specialist on John Law, is the author of *Crédit publique et Banque d'État en France du XVI^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle,* a financial history rich in facts and ideas and based on a quantity of new material (Paris, Droz, pp. 221).

The doctoral thesis of Wilbert Harold Dalgleish on *The Company of the Indies in the days of Dupleix* (Easton, Pa., Chemical Publishing Company, pp. 238) exploits in pedestrian but thorough fashion the considerable materials which have been collected and printed in connection with this aspect of French colonial history and, as well, the manuscript materials in the various archives in France, to show the organization and operation of the company as a business firm. Although the thesis lacks a proper background of the history of business practices, it is rich with usable data for the economic historian. Some important questions, notably the development of marine insurance, are left untouched. Otherwise, Dr. Dalgleish spared his readers nothing, not even the *concierges* and the candles. F. L. N.

In his *Questions agraires au temps de la Terreur* (Strasbourg, F. Lenig, 1932, pp. 256, 35 fr.), a volume belonging to the series of Documents inédits sur l'histoire économique de la Révolution française, Professor Georges Lefebvre discusses the significance and fate of the decrees of *Ventôse* sponsored by the Robespierrist group in the committee of public safety. He approaches the subject from two points of view, first, the historical setting, the public land policy of successive Revolutionary assemblies, and, second, the relation of St. Just's proposals to any thoroughgoing plan for the relief of the poor, and especially the poverty-stricken peasant. He points out that many proposals had already been made to relieve the indigent by placing them on small farms set aside from Church or *émigré* lands. The decree of 8 ventôse, an II., was in a sense only another of the series. Previous attempts had been blocked by the fear of weakening the security of the assignats. The Robespierrists meant that a new category of lands, taken from persons designated as suspects, should be used to endow the indigent. The scheme broke down before opposition in the committees and in the Convention, but Professor Lefebvre shows that it was far from meeting the actual needs of the rural population, which suffered from the marked tendency to consolidate holdings, from the unsatisfactory relations between renters on a large scale and their métayers, and from the conquences of enclosures. Documents which illustrate these problems occupy the last half of the volume. It is surprising that Professor Lefebvre should repeat the error of ascribing to Arthur Young the statement that seven-eighths of the arable land of France was cultivated under the métayer system. It is true that Young uses those words (1st ed., p. 398), but at the close of the passage (p. 406) Young remarks, "In the preceding observations, I have had rented farms only in view; but there is another sort which abounds in almost every part of France . . . I mean small

properties; that is, little farms, belonging to those who cultivate them. The number is so great, that I am inclined to suppose more than one-third of the kingdom occupied by them." His seven-eighths obviously refers to rented lands. B.

The Institut Français de Washington has published *Iconographie métallique du général Lafayette: Essai de répertoire des médailles, médaillons et jetons frappés à son nom ou à son effigie tant en France qu'en Amérique,* by Dr. P. Olivier. The total number listed and described, with many illustrations, is 143. Of these nos. 34–39 commemorate the visit of 1824–1825 in America. The episode most productive in this mode of commemoration was the July Revolution—calling forth nos. 47–104. The American publisher is The Johns Hopkins Press (pp. ix, 85, $2.50).

Lamartine's love of the countryside is well known and the effect of this passion has been treated frequently, but it has been confined almost entirely to his life at the family estate near Milly in Burgundy. M. Édouard Drouot's little volume entitled *Un chapitre de la vie de Lamartine: Montculot-Urcy d'après des documents inédits* (Paris, J. Gamber, 1932, pp. 141, 15 fr.) reveals an earlier phase in this aspect of Lamartine's life and interests, treating of the relations between the poet and his uncle, Jean-Baptiste, ecclesiastic *sécularisé*—thanks to the Revolution—who inherited the small domain of Montculot. There Jean-Baptiste offered his nephew an asylum from his discontents and from the world that, at first, Lamartine found so disturbing. He also gave him frequent monetary assistance from a purse that was never well filled. In 1826, Jean-Baptiste died and left Montculot to his nephew. It was then that Lamartine experienced, for the first time, the dignity and delights as well as the financial perplexities of a chatelain whose inheritance was already heavily burdened with debts. The poet entered upon his duties with fervor and set himself to work upon those humanitarian experiments that he later developed so extensively at Milly. Montculot played, as well, a part in his literary development. It served as the inspiration for some of his earlier work which included *Les étoiles* and *La source dans les bois D. . . .* Later, a family crisis and increased financial difficulties forced Lamartine to part reluctantly with his domain which had been a place of refuge and the source of his early poetic inspiration. J. M. S. A.

The Librairie Plon is republishing in its series entitled Bibliothèque historique and at a uniform price of 15 francs, bound, works which still possess considerable interest, but are out of print. Among them are *Avec Bonaparte en Italie et en Égypte: Mémoires du général baron Desvernois,* by Albert Dufourcq; *Madame de Staël et Napoléon,* by Paul Gautier; *Marie Stuart,* by Lady Blennerhassett; *Le roi chez la reine,* by Armand Baschet; *La Russie au temps d'Elisabeth I^re^,* by K. Waliszewski; and *La femme du Grand Condé,* by Claire-Clémence de Maillé-Brézé.

Articles: Ch. Gailly de Taurines, *La question de Gergovie* (Rev. Études Hist., July); Victor Carrière, *Pour refaire la 'Gallia Christiana': Chronologie et biographies épiscopales* (Rev. Hist. Église de France, Apr.); M. François, *Les sources de l'histoire religieuse de la France au Vatican* (*ibid.*, July); Charles Bruneau, *Saint Nicholas, patron de la Lorraine* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 3); Fabien Thibault, *La condition des personnes en France du IX^e siècle au mouvement communal* (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., July); Walther Kienast, *Der französische Staat im dreizehnten Jahrhundert* (Hist. Zeitsch., Aug.); Roger Doucet, *Le grand Parti de Lyon au XVI^e siècle* [concl'd] (Rev. Hist., July); Georges Michel, *Vauban homme politique* (Rev. Sci. Pol., July); H. Le Marquand, *Un faux témoin du drame de La Hougue* (*ibid.*); Samuel Germain, *Alchimistes et chimistes lorrains au début du XVII^e siècle* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 3); Joseph Aynard, *La bourgeoisie au XVIII^e siècle* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Sept.); Constantia Maxwell, *The Life and Work of Turgot* (History, Oct.); H. Lévy-Bruhl, *La noblesse de France et le commerce à la fin de l'Ancien Régime* (Rev. Hist. Mod., May); André Gain, *L'enseignement supérieur à Nancy de 1789 à 1896* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 3); Mareschal de Bièvre, *Les tribulations de M. de Beaumarchais exploitant forestier, 1766–1781* (Rev. Études Hist., July); Marcel Marion, *Le brigandage dans les débuts de la Révolution* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Sept.); Abbé Humbert, *Calonne en Lorraine* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 3); J. Thompson, *L'organisation du travail du Comité de Salut public* (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., Sept.); M. Bouloiseau, *Les Comités de Surveillance des arrondissements Parisiens* (*ibid.*); Michel Eude, *La Commune Robespierriste* (*ibid.*); Gaston Martin, *La vie bourgeoise à Nantes sous la Convention d'après le livre de comptes de Mme. Hummel, 1793–1795* (Rev. Fr., July); P. Caron, *Les "Défenseurs de la République"* (*ibid.*); E. Pollio, *Le commerce maritime pendant la Révolution* [concl'd] (*ibid.*); Albert Mathiez, *Le personnel gouvernemental du Directoire* [a chapter from a book upon which the late Professor Mathiez was engaged at the time of his death] (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., Sept.); Marcel Marion, *A propos du catéchisme de 1806* (Rev. Études Hist.); Franklin D. Scott, *Bernadotte and the Throne of France, 1814* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.); Jean Collot, *La franc-maçonnerie en 1848* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); Annie L. Lamb, *A New Englander looks at Louis Napoleon* (New Eng. Quar., Sept.).

Documents: *Le livre vert d'un page de Monsieur: Mémoires de Jean-Marc de Royère* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); A. Fugier and J. Maubourguet, ed., *Lettres de Versailles sur les États-Généraux* [chiefly by Madame de Molènes, wife of the proprietor of the Salle du Jeu de Paume, to her brother-in-law, the mayor of Domme] (Rev. Ques. Hist., Sept.); P. Chantecaille, *Lettres inédites de la Duchesse de Berry* (Rev. Études Hist.).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

The volume on *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kirchenvogtei im 10. Jahrhundert,* by Dr. Eberhard F. Otto [Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte] (Berlin-Grunewald, Walther Rothschild, pp. xvi, 171, 6 M.) shows that until the middle of the tenth century the *Vogt* of a German bishop or abbot was, except in Saxony, usually a *Meier,* a man who owed ecclesiastical non-noble service. Even when a count was a bishop or abbot he usually was served by such a *Meier-Vogt.* In Otto I.'s reign members of the noble class begin to appear in this office, a change which Dr. Otto tries to explain. He finds roots of this revolution possibly in the *avouerie seigneuriale* of northern and northeastern Gaul, and certainly in the earlier Saxon practice. The latter usage Otto I. extended to Germany as a whole in his effort to obtain from the churchmen the support which his throne needed. Unquestionably Dr. Otto has made full use of the few scattered documents in building up a thesis that is convincing. F. J. T.

The city of Bremen's commercial importance in the early Middle Ages, especially as the chief *entrepôt* for Scandinavian furs as far as the Danube, was very great. Subsequently it fell far behind Hamburg and Lübeck and for a time even left the Hanseatic League. For what basic reasons it managed to regain its greatness, to maintain its status as a free city, and to outstrip Lübeck even before the nineteenth century, remains a problem for the economic historian. A useful contribution to its solution is the monograph by Elisabeth Höfinghoff, *Die bremischen Textilgewerbe vom 16. bis zur Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Bremen, Winter, pp. 252).

A new theory of the origin of the Swiss Confederation was set forth in 1930 by Adolf Gasser. In his new book he offers a chronological study of *Die territoriale Entwicklung der schweizerischen Eidengossenschaft, 1291 bis 1797,* together with an elaborate historical map, portraying the situation at twelve different periods (Aarau, Sauerländer, 1932, pp. vii, 196).

An attempt has been made by Karl Hans Rendenbach in *Die Fehde von Sickingens gegen Trier* (Berlin, Emil Ebering, pp. 116, 4.80 M.) to show that Sickingen's expedition was not a mere robber-knight affair but a *coup d'état* with an electorate in view for himself and a change in the constitution of the Empire as the general aim.

Dr. Albert Brackmann, of the *Historische Zeitschrift,* is the editor of a volume on *Deutschland und Polen: Beiträge zu ihren geschichtlichen Beziehungen* (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, pp. 279, eight maps, 6 M.), the aim of which is to show historically the close relations of the two peoples. Among the contributors, besides Dr. Brackmann, are such well-known scholars as Karl Brandi, Otto Hoetzsch, Gerhard Ritter, Hermann Oncken, Fritz Hartung, and Hans Rothfels.

Previously unpublished or anonymously published essays appear in the *Politische Schriften von Johann Gustav Droysen,* edited by Felix Gilbert under the auspices of the Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Munich, Oldenbourg, pp. 382).

A history of German naval expenses resting on a solid statistical basis has been prepared by Heinz Junghänel under the title *Marinehaushalt und Marineausgabenpolitik in Deutschland, 1868–1930* (Veröffentlichungen aus dem Budgetarchiv an der Universität Leipzig, 1932, pp. 141).

François-Joseph: L'effondrement d'un Empire (Paris, Armand Colin, pp. 454, 28 fr.), by Karl Tschuppik, is a translation from the German of the volume which the author published five years ago. The portrait is sympathetic, drawn by a man whose family had served the Hapsburgs for generations and who himself was a journalist of long experience. It is Herr Tschuppik's own observations which give the work its special value. His views of the domestic policies of the emperor are of greater weight than his judgment upon foreign relations. He sees in Francis Joseph's history a battle between Hapsburg illusions and reality.

L'affaire Eulenburg et les origines de la Guerre Mondiale (Paris, Payot, pp. 281, 20 fr.), by Maurice Baumont, known for his remarkable book on *L'abdication de Guillaume II.,* presents the view that the ruin of the Kaiser's intimate "Phili" removed a counselor who spoke for moderation and for peace and made it easier for William II. to be swept on with the rising tide of Pan-Germanism toward the catastrophe of 1914. If this interpretation be correct, history, as the author remarks, "passe par l'égout". Fortunately before the story of the Harden attacks and the suits which followed opens there are many interesting pages on Eulenburg's career as "L'ami du roi" and on his one-time friend but later enemy "L'Éminence Grise".

Articles: P. Kehr, *Bericht über die Herausgabe der Monumenta Germaniae historica, 1932* (Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wissenschaften, XXVIII., 1933); Ferdinand Kloss, *Das räumliche Bild der Grundherrschaft in Böhmen bis zum Ende des XII. Jahrhunderts* [III.] (Mitteil. Verein. f. Gesch. der Deutschen in Böhmen, LXXI., nos. 1–2); Walther Köhler, *Die deutsche Kaiseridee am Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov.); Paul Guggisberg, *Der bernische Salzhandel* (Arch. Hist. Vereins des Kantons Bern, XXXII., no. 1); Hedwig Hintze, *Fichte und Frankreich* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Nov.); G. P. Gooch, *Prince Bülow and his Memoirs* (History, July).

Documents: Ewald Reinhard, ed., *Briefe Karl Ludwig von Hallers an Anton Freiherrn von Salis-Soglio* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Nov.); Emil Meyer, ed., *Der bernische Salztraktat mit der grossen Saline von Salins vom Jahre 1448* (Arch. Hist. Vereins des Kantons Bern, XXXII., no. 1).

E. N. C.

ITALY

General review: Giovanni Costa, *Rassegna di studi su Roma* (N. Riv. Stor., May); Maximilian Claar, *Cavour und das Risorgimento: Neue italienische Literatur* (Hist. Zeitsch., Aug.).

The publication, entitled *Lettere di Piero Benintendi, mercante del trecento* [*Atti della Società Ligure di storia patria,* volume LX., fasc. 1] (Genoa, 1932, pp. 171), edited by Renato Piattoli, vivifies and illuminates a brief period (1392–1409) in the history of Italian commerce. The letters are from the Datini archives. In them Piero Benintendi of Prato, residing in Genoa, informs his friend and compatriot, the powerful merchant Francesco di Marco Datini, concerning Genoese conditions. He discusses such subjects as the constant civil discord in his adopted city from 1392 to 1401, the arrival and the policy of the French governor in 1401, the movements of the antipope, Benedict XIII., and the incessant ravages of pestilence. As lessee of the local customs, he notifies Francesco of the marks used by customs officials. He reports the progress of a legal case incurred by Datini for customs evasion. Piero's personal affairs afford an interesting view of social conditions. A valuable introduction is provided and the letters in the appendix amplify the information secured from the Benintendi correspondence. Many of these supplementary letters are of real importance. A brief glossary of unusual words in dialect, and a complete biographical and geographical index are appended. K. J. G.

The Italian government cherishes the plan to establish a branch of the state archival system in every provincial capital. Of the ninety-three provinces, half are now so equipped through the addition of nineteen new branches during 1933 to the twenty-three previously existing. The new branches are practically all in the former Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the material (especially important in the economic and financial field) having been gathered in local archives by the Bourbon rulers. A valuable survey of these collections has been made by the royal archivist, Giacomo Gorrini in *Archivio provinciali di stato* (Florence, Olschki).

New light is thrown on the splendid art-loving papal court of the sixteenth century by the posthumous work of Léon Dorez, *La cour du pape Paul III. d'après les régistres de la trésorerie secrète* (Paris, Leroux, 1932, 2 vols., pp. xi, 390; v, 339).

Vols. LIII.-LV. of the *Archivio della R. società romana di storia patria* are issued in one stout volume, containing among others these articles: I padri bollandisti Henschenio e Papebrochio a Roma nel 1660–61 by M. Battistini, Serie cronologica dei senatori di Roma dal 1431 al 1447 [with documents] by A. Salimei, La flotta di Callisto III., 1455–1458 by P. Paschini, Una vertenza cavalleresca di Virginio Orsini [1593] by E. Rossi, Un inchiesta

agraria e un referendum sul lusso agli Albori dell' 700 [1703–1704] by A. Lodolini, Lo statuto di Traetto (Minturno) dell' anno 1751 by Angelo De Santis, Cinque lettere inedite di Lelio Capilupi [1546, 1557] by L. Berra. There is also the fifth section of a Bibliografia di storia pontificale, containing 203 items published since 1920; the four previous sections may be found in vols. XLVI., XLVII., L., and LI.

Articles: Ginevra Zanetti, *Il commune di Milano dalla genesi del Consolato fino all' inizio del periodo podestarile* (Arch. Stor. Lombardo, LX., nos. 1–2); Luigi Chiappelli, *I rettori di Pistoia dall' età longobarda all' anno 1306* (Arch. Stor. Ital., Sept.); T. S. R. Boase, *Boniface VIII. and Bologna* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); Giovanni Cardello, *Gli statuti del Collegio dei Medici di Alessandria* [1640] (Riv. Stor. Arte e Arch. per la Provincia di Alessandria, Apr.); Gioacchino Volpe, *Italia ed Europa durante il Risorgimento* (N. Antol., Aug. 16); Albert Pingaud, *Le Royaume d'Italie en 1812* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., July); Alessandro Levi, *La politica di Daniele Manin* (N. Riv. Stor., May).

Documents: Aldo Romano, *Lafayette, Guglielmo Pepe e l'Italia: Un carteggio inedito* [1823–1831] (Rassegna Stor. del Risorgimento, July); Ugo G. Oxilia, *Tre conclavi* [elections of Leo XII., Pius VIII., Gregory XVI.] (*ibid.*); Gino Bandini, ed., *Maria Teresa regina di Sardegna e Maria Adelaide duchessa di Savoia: Lettere a Ferdinando duca di Genova durante la campagna del 1848* [I., concl.] (N. Antol., Oct. 1, 16).

E. N. C.

NORTHERN EUROPE

A bibliography of Danish history for the year 1930 (*Fortegnelse over historisk Litteratur for Aaret 1930 vedrörende Danmarks Historie*), prepared by H. Brun, is published in *Historisk Tidsskrift* (Dan.), 1933, nos. 2–3.

Kancelliets Brevböger vedrörende Danmarks indre Forhold i Uddrag, 1630–1632 (Copenhagen, Reitzel, 1932) is a volume of materials concerned with domestic affairs in Denmark in the years following the peace of Lübeck. The editor is E. Marquand of the Danish national archives.

The earlier history of Stora Kopparberget, an industrial organization for the exploitation of mineral wealth in Sweden, which dates from the thirteenth century and claims to be one of the oldest of its kind in the world, has been made the subject of an extended academic dissertation by Tom Söderberg (*Stora Kopparberget under medeltiden och Gustav Vasa,* Stockholm, Victor Petterson, 1932, pp. xxxi, 501).

Krisen vid de svenska arméerna i Tyskland efter Banérs död, by Per Sörensson, is primarily a study of the difficult situation in which the Swedish forces in central Germany found themselves on the eve of the battle of

Wolfenbüttel (1641). Considerable space is also given to a discussion of the Swedish military organization and to the tactics employed by the great Swedish captains (Stockholm, 1931, pp. 156).

The current year book of the Swedish 'Caroline Society' (*Karolinska förbundets årsbok*, 1931, Lund, 1932) is composed of a series of studies, reports, and other documents, all having to do with the reign of Charles XII.

The authorities of the national archives of the young Esthonian republic have begun the publication of a series of volumes dealing with the work of the archives or drawn from their collections. Two volumes have thus far been issued: No. 1 is a collection of *Polonica im estnischen staatlichen Zentralarchiv*, edited by N. Treumuth and O. Liiv (Tartu, 1931, pp. 160); No. 2 is a *Bericht über die Tätigkeit des estnischen staatlichen Zentralarchiv*, 1921–1932 (Tartu, 1932, pp. viii, 180).

Articles: J. Olrik, *Studier over Saxes historiske Kilder* [studies on the sources of Saxo's history] (Hist. Tidssk., 1933, nos. 2–3); Johan Schreiner, *Hans Nielsen Hauge og "samfundets fellesskap"* [common ownership in Hauge's religious society] (*ibid.*, Norw., 1933, no. 1); R. Ekblom, *Vereinigungen unter den Nordländern im alten Russland* (Zeitsch. Slav. Philol., 1933, nos. 1–2); G. B. Volz, *Katharina II. und ihr Hof, 1779–1780* (Zeitsch. Osteur. Gesch., 1933, no. 2); N. Brian-Chaninov, *Alexandre I^er^ et la paix* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., 1933, no. 3); K. Kurnatowski, *Les origines du capitalisme en Pologne* (Rev. Hist. Mod., May); Stanislas Bednarski, *Déclin et renaissance de l'enseignement des Jésuites en Pologne* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Jesu, July).

L. M. L.

THE FAR EAST

General review: John Gilbert Reid, *Brief Survey of German Works on Modern Chinese History* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Sept.); Frank A. Lundy, *The Dutch East Indies: a Bibliographical Essay* (*ibid.*).

The third issue of *The Romance of Japan through the Ages*, by James A. B. Scherer, Ph.D., LL.D., formerly president of the California Institute of Technology (Tokyo, Hokuseido Press, pp. ix, 326, $2.80), first published in 1926, apparently contains few if any alterations in the text of the previous editions. It says nothing of the recent adventure in Manchukuo and speaks of Japan as having "adopted a more liberal policy toward China". The title indicates the general character of the work. The purpose is to give a sympathetic account of Japan's past for "the man in the street", and this is accomplished chiefly by recounting what the author calls "the seven ages of Japan" in terms of the outstanding personalities and incidents of each. A vivid, pleasant style and a warm admiration for Japan contribute to the objective of achieving in the American reading public an appreciation of the better side

of the empire and its culture. The author is not always critical and here and there is guilty of mistakes of fact, but in the main he has consulted and followed the well-known standard authorities. K. S. L.

The Russo-Japanese Treaties of 1907–1916 concerning Manchuria and Mongolia, by Ernest Batson Price, associate member of the Page School [The Walter Hines Page School of International Relations] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, pp. xiv, 164, $1.75), is devoted to a study of seven treaties, three of them public and four secret, which marked the development of Russo-Japanese recognition of their respective interests in Manchuria and Mongolia. Facsimiles are appended of three of the secret treaties, as well as a copy of the French text of the fourth, while a facsimile is also printed of the much-discussed Russo-Chinese secret treaty of alliance of June 3, 1896. The text presents the results of diligent research and sound scholarship, and its definitiveness is only limited by gaps in the available materials. Until the Japanese foreign office adopts a more generous attitude in respect to the publication of its archives no study of Japanese diplomacy can be considered really definitive. P. J. T.

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: account book of Joshua Mercereau, deputy commissary of prisoners (from Burgoyne's army), 1777–1779; account book of Parkinson and Burr, commission merchants, New York, May 26–August 4, 1787; letters of Ira Ingram, Vermonter in Texas, 1825–1837; additional papers of Thomas Ewing (1789–1871), dated 1841; photocopies of twelve papers of Robert E. Lee; additional papers of Thomas F. Bayard, 1844–1892, about 800 pieces; journal of William E. Bernard, Thetford, Vt., and Dartmouth College, 1851–1853; 200-odd papers, mainly addressed to Governor Henry A. Wise and relating to John Brown; about 180 papers of or relating to William J. Bryan, 1877–1931; and various memoranda and notes made by the President's Research Committee on Social Trends.

The Carnegie Institution of Washington has issued a study by Dr. Charles O. Paullin of the question whether the house at Wakefield where Washington was born was actually located on Popes Creek, the place chosen by the Memorial Association for the erection of a mansion in the style of the original, or was located more than a mile away on Bridges Creek, where the graveyard of the family is to be found. From an examination of property transfers and other documents Dr. Paullin has shown that the Popes Creek site is the correct location.

The monograph on *Joel Barlow, Revolutionist, London, 1791–92* (Ham-

burg, Friederichsen, De Gruyter, 1932, pp. vi, 99), by Victor Clyde Miller, State Teachers College, Terre Haute, is limited to the period of Barlow's brief residence in London. The author worked under the direction of Dr. Emil Wolff, of the University of Hamburg, and drew his materials from the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and Stationers Hall. The research is definitive. An account is first given of Barlow's doings and then follows a discussion of his writings. The author's conclusion is that though probably a sincere republican, Barlow became a revolutionary propagandist in order to better his fortune. In this endeavor, he was moderately successful. As "a refurbisher of second-hand goods" he was "a near-master". M. B. G.

American Policy of Recognition towards Mexico, by Stuart Alexander MacCorkle (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, pp. 109, $1.00), is an academic exercise neither thoroughly worked out nor suggestive. The author has attempted to construct a historical study of the policy of the United States in its recognition or non-recognition of the many successive governments of Mexico. Most of the material he has used is from well-known secondary accounts in English, though he has had recourse to the printed diplomatic correspondence and even to the archives of the Department of State. The only chapter of some original value is that on the recognition of the Diaz government, in which lengthy extracts are printed from some of the hitherto unpublished papers in those archives. But works like J. M. Callahan's *Foreign Policy of the United States in its Relations with Mexico,* H. M. Wriston's *Executive Agents,* Justin Smith's *Annexation of Texas,* Corti's *Maximilian,* and Duniway's study on Seward's policy toward Napoleon III., to mention only well-known works in English, appear unknown to him. He used no Spanish material. The political and diplomatic implications of recognition mostly escape him. S. F. B.

Professor H. C. Hockett has prepared a second edition of his *Political and Social Growth of the United States, 1492–1852* (Macmillan, pp. xviii, 652, $3.00), concluding it with the adoption of the Compromise of 1850, instead of with the election of Andrew Jackson, as before. For this purpose he has utilized the material in the first eight chapters of the companion volume, written by Professor A. M. Schlesinger.

Professor Isaac Lippincott's *Economic Development of the United States,* which was originally published in 1921 (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXVII. 583), has reached a third edition (Appleton, pp. xxii, 734, $4.00). The author has utilized the opportunity not only to bring his treatment down to date but also to rewrite sections of the text in the light of later experience, especially of the phenomena of the great economic collapse.

The volume entitled *History of the Foreign Policy of the United States,* by Robert L. Jones, Ph.D. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. viii, 536, $3.50), is a

textbook presenting a survey of the history of American diplomacy. It explains early American foreign policy as one of isolation, thus overstressing what was really a matter of independence. The documentation is uneven and unnecessarily elaborate. It has the advantage of devoting more space than former manuals to events since 1898. The Far Eastern Crisis stops with the bare mention of Japan's occupation of Manchuria (1931). After that there are over one hundred pages devoted to the United States and the League, the Court, and international peace.

A new edition of Professor David Saville Muzzey's *The United States:* II., *From the Civil War* (Ginn, pp. 839) includes a chapter on The Test of the Republic, bringing the treatment to the close of 1932. Professor Muzzey, in collaboration with Dr. John A. Krout, has also published an *American History for Colleges* (Ginn, pp. viii, 872). In this the recent period is emphasized, half the volume being devoted to the last fifty years.

To the series called Americana Deserta, edited by Bernard De Voto, has been added *The Partisan Leader,* by Nathaniel Beverley Tucker (Knopf, pp. xxxiv, 277, $3.00). The editor, Professor Carl Bridenbaugh, regards it not so much as a novel, but as "an actual case-history in the development of the sentiments which ended in the Civil War". He has provided a historical introduction of more than ordinary interest, giving an account of the life of Tucker, whose later years were spent as professor of law in William and Mary College. The book appeared during the Van Buren campaign of 1836, and Professor Bridenbaugh tells us, "It was written primarily to support the great cause of States Rights, and . . . its greatest importance is in the realm of political speculation". Tucker, he also remarks, was a man of "almost incomprehensible consistency", who talked and wrote "as if nothing had happened since 1798".

American Policy in the Pacific (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, pp. v, 274, $2.50), edited by Ernest Minor Patterson, Ph.D., professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania, is made up of papers presented at the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Academy on April 7 and 8.

Articles: Marquis de Saint-Pierre, *Les Normands en Amérique avant Christophe Colomb* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); Paul Kahle, *A Lost Map of Columbus* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); Alexander J. Wall, *The Flag with an Eagle in the Canton* (New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull., Oct.); Robert G. Caldwell, *The Rôle of Parties* (Rice Inst. Pamphlet, Apr.); Allen Walker Read, *The Comment of British Travelers on Early American Terms relating to Agriculture* (Agricultural Hist., July); Harold A. Innis, *Interrelations between the Fur Trade of Canada and the United States* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); R. Earl McClendon, *The Amistad Claims: Inconsistencies of*

Policy (Pol. Sci. Quar., Sept.); Hallie M. McPherson, *The Plan of William McKendree Gwin for a Colony in North Mexico, 1863–1865* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Dec.); Paul H. Clyde, *Attitudes and Policies of George F. Seward, American Minister at Peking, 1876–1880* (*ibid.*); Donald Rowland, *The United States and the Contract Labor Question in Hawaii, 1862–1900* (*ibid.*, Sept.); Harold J. Noble, *The United States and Sino-Korean Relations, 1885–1887* (*ibid.*); Louise Overacker, *Campaign Funds in a Depression Year* (Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., Oct.); M. Ogden Phillips, *The Tariff and the South* (South Atlantic Quar., Oct.); Frank Whitson Fetter, *Congressional Tariff Theory* [analysis of views expressed in debates on the Hawley-Smoot act] (Am. Ec. Rev., Sept.).

Documents: Joseph B. Lockey, ed., *An Early Pan-American Scheme* [presented to Secretary of State Monroe in 1812 by William Shaler] (Pacific Hist. Rev., Dec.); Rev. Thomas McAvoy, ed., *War Letters of Father Peter Paul Cooney of the Congregation of Holy Cross* [IV.] (Am. Cath. Hist. Soc., Sept.).

NEW ENGLAND

The Essex Institute has recently acquired the letters and papers of Governor Nathaniel P. Banks, who was also a general in the Civil War. To its collection of shipping documents it has added the Lovett papers. Another important accession is the Pingree account books and manuscripts, belonging to a family interested in shipping, railroads, mills, and trade with West Africa. These papers are typical of the business trend of merchants in the period after the War of 1812. Still another acquisition is the Colonel Josiah and Moses Little plans and other papers connected with the Pejepscot purchase in what is now Maine.

In 1931 the Tercentenary Commission of the state of Connecticut established a Committee on Historical Publications composed of Professor Charles M. Andrews of Yale, chairman, Albert C. Bates, secretary of the Connecticut Historical Society, secretary, Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University, George S. Godard, state librarian, Dr. Walter R. Steiner of Hartford, and Dr. George C. F. Williams of Hartford, chairman of the Commission, *ex officio*. On the retirement of Professor Andrews from the chairmanship in June, 1933, Professor Dutcher was chosen to replace him. The committee has undertaken the publication of a series of monograph pamphlets on selected topics in the political, economic, social, religious, and cultural history of Connecticut and has been fortunate in securing the coöperation of a goodly number of competent persons in their preparation. Twenty of these pamphlets are now in print and on sale by the Yale University Press. It is planned to continue issuing additional numbers through 1935, which has been chosen as the year for general tercentenary celebration throughout the state. G. M. D.

The Connecticut Historical Society has received on deposit the papers of Governor Tomlinson, 3500 letters and drafts of replies.

Articles: Jonathan T. Lincoln, *Beginnings of the Machine Age in New England: Documents relating to the Introduction of the Power Loom* (Bull. Business Hist. Soc., Oct.); Edward K. Rand, *Early Education at Harvard* (New Eng. Quar., Sept.); John A. Kouwenhoven, *Singing in New England* (*ibid.*).

Documents: *Letter of the Rev. Abraham Jarvis of Connecticut to Rev. Mr. Samuel Peters, Loyalist Refugee in London* [1796] (Hist. Mag. of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Oct.).

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The New York State Historical Association held its Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting at Ticonderoga on September 14–16. In numbers attending and in the character of the papers and addresses, it was one of the most successful meetings in the history of the association. Among the papers presented were Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox's presidential address narrating the rise of natural science in New York, Dr. Allan Nevins's paper on Abram S. Hewitt and the election of 1876, Dr. Dexter Perkins's paper on William H. Seward as governor of New York, Miss Elisabeth Cutting's account of Champlain as a navigator, and Mr. J. C. Long's article on Sir Jeffery Amherst and the campaign of 1759. In connection with the annual meeting a tablet to the Marquis de Lotbinière, builder of the French fort at Ticonderoga and friend to the American cause in the Revolution, was unveiled in the presence of a large delegation of distinguished Canadian and French officials and members of the Lotbinière family. Announcement was made of an increase in the membership of the association and of the publication of volumes III. and IV. of the *History of the State of New York*. The association's manuscript inventory has brought to its library at Ticonderoga several volumes of rare northern New York and Vermont newspapers: Albany *Argus*, 1850; (Brandon) *Vermont Tribune*, 1846; *Rural New Yorker*, 1859–1861; *Essex County Republican*, 1889–1906; and scattered issues of various Essex County newspapers between 1827 and 1861. The survey has also located bound files of the *Essex County Republican*, 1868–1933; (Keeseville) *Northern Standard*, 1858–1860; Westport (N. Y.) *Patriot*, 1846–1850; Elizabethtown *Times*, 1833–1834; and Elizabethtown *Post*, 1860–1906. It is expected that the last three files will soon be acquired by the association. In addition to these newspapers, several hundred Civil War letters pertaining to northern New York and other documents have been given to the association, as well as the papers of Absalom and Orson Morse, surveyors and land dealers (1772–1900), numbering about 500 pieces. J. P. B.

New York History for October, the quarterly of the New York State Historical Association, is devoted to the proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting at Southampton a year ago, and to the special meeting at Syracuse earlier in 1932. Among the papers printed are: Lyndon, New York, the Biography of a Town, by Frederick S. Parkhurst; Samuel A. Law, Entrepreneur, 1798–1845, by Samuel Rezneck; and Cadwallader Colden, Second, an Ulster County Tory, by Joseph Bragdon.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania recently acquired the Brinley copy, the only one known, of *A Tribute to Caesar,* printed probably by Andrew Bradford, of Philadelphia, in 1715. This book is a bitter condemnation of a sermon preached by Thomas Story in September, 1711, in which he urged the Quakers to pay the tax for the Canadian expedition of that year. As a result of his refusal to pay this tax the author lost his land in New Jersey and a lot in Philadelphia. Another important accession is Lord Lansdowne's copy of the first map of Pennsylvania (1681), made in anticipation of the settlement, which does not show the proposed site of Philadelphia. The original owner of the map was Sir William Petty, a friend of Penn. Penn's *Brief Account of Pennsylvania,* somewhat shortened and modified, appears below the map. The existence of the map and the description was first made known by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, who discovered a copy in the John Carter Brown Library. The other known copy is in the British Museum. Further Penn documents have been acquired by the society, together with a collection of manuscripts dealing with the colonial Indian commissioners of Pennsylvania, and many land patents for land in Reading.

John Frederick Lewis, president of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, marked the fiftieth anniversary of his admission to the Philadelphia Bar by publishing an account, with accompanying documents, of *Thomas Spry, Lawyer and Physician* (Philadelphia, privately printed, 1932, pp. ix, 126). As the author states in his subtitle Spry was the first attorney to practice under English law in the Delaware River settlements. The volume is handsomely printed and adorned with portraits and reproductions of documents.

A half dozen incidents in the history of Reading, Pennsylvania, are related by J. Bennett Nolan in the *Annals of Penn Square* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 106, $1.50). One of the most curious is the uncomfortably warm reception given to Albert Gallatin at the time of the X Y Z affair, because he was taken for a partisan of France. Another visitor to the city was the exiled Joseph Bonaparte.

The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania has acquired, among other papers, transcripts of the records of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Brownsville, Pennsylvania, for 1849–1858, and reproductions of two documents in the Spanish archives relating to the Whiskey Insurrection.

The director, Dr. Solon J. Buck, has in preparation a volume dealing with the history of Western Pennsylvania to 1815, with emphasis on social and economic aspects.

Articles: E. Clowes Chorley, *Samuel Provoost, First Bishop of New York* [II.] (Hist. Mag. of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Oct.); Roy F. Nichols, *A Great Party which might have been born in Philadelphia* [August, 1866] (Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Oct.); John B. McMaster, *The Johnstown Flood* [II.] (*ibid.*); John Umble, *Amish Mennonites of Union County, Pennsylvania* [II.] (Mennonite Quar. Rev., July); Alfred P. James, *The Significance of Western Pennsylvania in American History* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Nov.); Arthur Cecil Bining, *The Rise of Iron Manufacture in Western Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*); W. R. Jillson, *Filson's Map of Wilmington, Delaware* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Oct.).

Documents: *Western Pennsylvania in 1836 as seen by a Vermont Doctor* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Nov.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The traveler in search of historic Virginia who should return to Williamsburg, the old state capital, after an interval of three years, would be astonished and delighted with the progress which had been made by what is termed the "Williamsburg Restoration". He will be fortunate if he enters the town on either the road from Yorktown or the road from Jamestown, for on the Richmond road there is a modern suburb which is a poor introduction to a colonial community. The work of restoration on the Duke of Gloucester Street, the Palace Green, the Court House Green, the Capitol grounds, and on the original College Campus is far advanced, if not completed. The Raleigh Tavern is one of the most informing textbooks of colonial life to be found anywhere. The Governor's Palace with its gardens will be something to marvel at. The scope of the whole enterprise is equally surprising: 352 houses of modern construction removed, 57 colonial buildings restored, 61 colonial buildings constructed, 2 business blocks and 25 shops and stores erected. All the work has been directed by a knowledge obtained after the most painstaking research, a knowledge now filed in an elaborate card index, for the benefit, perhaps, of future students of colonial days. Among the specialists whose counsel has been sought is a committee including Professors Andrews, Morison, Wertenbaker, and Dr. Swem.

Among recent accessions to the collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission are the diary of J. M. Patrick, 1816–1817, two volumes, twenty-four muster and pay rolls of the Fourth North Carolina Regiment, 1861–1865, the Colonel Archibald McEachern Papers, 1748–1859, the C. B. Heller Collection, 1735–1906, and the Julian S. Mann Collection, 1688–1875.

Professor W. B. Posey gives an account of La Grange, Alabama's Earliest College in the Birmingham-Southern College *Bulletin* for November.

Articles: R. S. Cotterill, *Federal Management in the South, 1789–1825* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); George C. Keidel, *Early Maryland Newspapers* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Sept.); Thomas D. Penniman, *The Early History of the "Baltimore American"* (*ibid.*); Frances Berkeley Young, *The First Edmund Berkeley in Virginia* (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Robert A. Stewart, *The First William Bird of Charles City County, Virginia* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); G. MacLaren Brydon, *The Clergy of the Established Church in Virginia* [concl'd] (*ibid.*); Philip G. Auchampaugh, *John W. Forney, Robert Tyler, and James Buchanan* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); B. U. Ratchford, *The Conversion of the North Carolina Public Debt after 1879* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Oct.); J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, *Southern Members of the Inns of Court* (*ibid.*); Susan S. Bennett, *The McCords of McCord's Ferry, South Carolina* (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); James H. Bass, *The Georgia Gubernatorial Elections of 1861 and 1863* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Sept.); William P. Brandon, *Calling the Georgia Constitutional Convention of 1877* (*ibid.*); Amelia Williams, *A Critical Study of the Siege of the Alamo and of the Personnel of its Defenders* [III.] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Oct.); A. B. Bender, *Opening Routes across West Texas, 1848–1850* (*ibid.*).

Documents: *Extracts from the Diary of William Faris of Annapolis, Maryland, January 4, 1792–August 9, 1804* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Sept.); *Secession and Coercion* [correspondence between Judge George W. Woodward and Judge Jeremiah S. Black] (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); Mrs. Kirkland Ruffin, *School-Boy Letters of Edmund Ruffin, jr., 1828–1829* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Oct.); Mabel L. Webber, ed., *Josiah Smith's Diary, 1780–1781* [concl'd] (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); Lucia B. S. Monroe, ed., *Avondale and Deerbrook Plantation Documents* [II.] (Georgia Hist. Quar., Sept.).

WESTERN STATES

The Abraham Lincoln Association has brought together in a single volume entitled *Lincoln, 1854–1861: being the Day-by-Day Activities of Abraham Lincoln* (Springfield, Illinois, pp. 400) seven accounts covering each of the years. The compiler is Paul M. Angle. Each week is given a page, and the spaces for the days are uniform in size. Many spaces, naturally, are blank, others are crowded, and would be overcrowded were certain supplementary explanations not reserved for an appendix. There are three maps, for 1854, 1856, and 1858, so drawn as to show the limits of the judicial districts in which Lincoln practiced, the places he visited, where he spoke,

and the railroads which had been completed by the year in question. There is a full index. The usefulness of such a work to students of Lincoln's career is impressive.

The Chicago Historical Society has inaugurated a series of historical lectures at its new home in Lincoln Park. Those for November and December were given by Professor James Alton James, of Northwestern University, and dealt with the beginnings of American history, discoveries, exploration, and settlement.

The Norwegian-American Historical Association has published a volume entitled *Norwegian Sailors in American Waters,* described in the subtitle as *A Study in the History of Maritime Activity on the Eastern Seaboard* (Northfield, the Association, pp. ix, 271, $2.50). The author is Professor Knut Gjerset, of Luther College. The first two chapters deal with the well-known Norse discoveries. In the chapter on the Period of the White Sails the author explains the part played by Norwegian sailors on the famous packet and clipper ships of the thirties and forties. He quotes the captain of the *Rocket* as saying that the Norwegians and the Swedes are "the best class of sailors that man our vessels". In a later chapter he describes and eulogizes the career of Andrew Furuseth, the real originator of the La Follette Act of 1915.

The second and final volume of *Minnesota in the War with Germany* (Minnesota Historical Society, $2.50), by Franklin F. Holbrook and Livia Appel, edited by Solon J. Buck, deals primarily with the "Home Front", containing chapters on such subjects as the Red Cross, the Welfare Agencies, Food Production and Conservation, Conservation of Fuel, and the Mobilization of Industry. Perhaps the one which will be read with the greatest interest is that entitled The Fight for Public Opinion, because we are now more seriously concerned with the dangers, than with the advantages, of nationalistic propaganda. The destructive consequences of war often last longer in public opinion than on battle-scarred fields and towns. One may well be shocked at the cartoon reproduced from the Minneapolis *Journal,* representing the Kaiser and an avenging fate, with the gibbet on the skyline.

Among recent accessions of the Minnesota Historical Society are photostatic copies of forty-eight documents relating to the activities of Radisson, Groseilliers, and others in the Hudson Bay country, to the efforts of the Hudson's Bay Company from 1682 to 1699 to remove the French from the region, and to Groseilliers's visit to London in 1665 and 1666. The originals of these documents are in the Public Record Office. The society has also received from Professor Oswald Veblen of Princeton University the thirty-volume diary of his father, Andrew A. Veblen, a volume of correspondence between Veblen and Joseph Dorfman relating to Thorstein Veblen, several scrapbooks of clippings concerning the Veblen brothers, and papers includ-

ing, among other things, information about the activities of the Norwegian-American *bygdelags*. Other recent acquisitions are an addition to the society's file of the Burlington, Iowa, *Saturday Evening Post,* which is now nearly complete for the period from 1911 to 1932, during which much valuable material relating to the navigation of the upper Mississippi was published in the *Post;* a file of the rare Sauk Rapids *Frontierman* from the first number, issued on April 26, 1855, through 1858; and over seven hundred photographs of Civil and Spanish-American War scenes and personages, together with about eighty lantern slides made from the photographs.

The Mercurio Volante of Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora: an Account of the First Expedition of Don Diego de Vargas into New Mexico in 1692, translated, with introduction and notes, by Irving Albert Leonard, Ph.D., University of California [Quivira Society Publications, III.] (Los Angeles, the Society, 1932, pp. 136), is a well edited and attractive presentation of a scholarly periodical of 1693, an example of a type of abortive journal which was just becoming common in Mexico in the late seventeenth century. Not only does the work carry out the Quivira Society's aim of reproducing early works on the history of the Hispanic Southwest, but it is a good sample of colonial journalism as practiced in New Spain. The volume consists of a secondary account, by Sigüenza y Góngora, Mexican savant, of Don Diego de Vargas's triumphant first *entrada* into New Mexico in 1692 for the purpose of recovering territories lost by the Pueblo uprising of 1680. Dr. Leonard provides an excellent thirty-four page introduction to place the work in its proper historical setting; and the Mexican professor's account follows in translation. The work is closed by a facsimile reproduction of the *Mercurio Volante* (pp. 91–129), and a short index. A number of appropriate illustrations and a map attributed to Sigüenza y Góngora are included in the volume. R. K. W.

Articles: Samuel L. Wilson, *Pioneer Kentucky in its Ethnological Aspect* (Reg. of the Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Daniel M. Robison, *Tennessee Politics and the Agrarian Revolt, 1886–1896* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *The First Printers of Illinois* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Kate L. Hregg, *The Boonslick Road in St. Charles County* [Il.] (Missouri Hist. Rev., Oct.); Claude S. Larzelere, *The Red Man in Michigan* (Michigan Hist. Mag., Summer and Autumn); Hugo Erichsen, *My Memories of Old Detroit* [concl'd] (*ibid.*); Ruth A. Gailaher, *The First Hundred Years: a Brief History of Iowa* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., Oct.); Robert J. Forrest, *Mythical Cities of Southwestern Minnesota* (Minnesota Hist., Sept.); Irene Barnes Taeuber, *Weekly Newspapers in Pioneer Minnesota* (*ibid.,* Dec.); Alban W. Hoopes, *Thomas S. Twiss, Indian Agent on the Upper Platte, 1855–1861* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); George A. Root,

Ferries in Kansas [II.] *Kansas River* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Aug.); LeRoy R. Hafen, *Mountain Men: Andrew W. Sublette* (Colorado Mag., Sept.); Carolyn T. Foreman, *Charity Hall: an Early Chickasaw School* (Chron. of Oklahoma, Sept.); Verna Laumbach, *Las Vegas before 1850* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Oct.); Mariano Cuevas, *The Missions of Lower California* (Mid-America, Oct.); Lindley Bynum, *Laws for the Better Government of California, 1848* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Sept.); Blake McKelvey, *Pacific Mail Service between Panamá and San Francisco, 1849–1851* (*ibid.*, Dec.); F. W. Howay, *The Resolution on the Oregon Coast, 1793–1794* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Sept.); Joseph Schafer, *Harvey W. Scott, Historian* (*ibid.*); J. Orin Oliphant, *The Cattle Trade on Puget Sound, 1858–1890* (Agricultural Hist., July); F. W. Howay, *Captain Cornelius Sowle on the Pacific* (Washington Hist. Quar., Oct.).

Documents: Lynn M. Case, ed., *The Middle West in 1837: Translations from the Notes of an Italian Count, Francesco Arese* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Frank Monaghan, ed., *The Proposed Settlement of New Ireland in Kentucky* (*ibid.*); *Biographical Field Notes of Lyman C. Draper: Toledo and Vicinity, 1863–1866* (Hist. Soc. Northwest. Ohio, Oct.); *Letters of Bishop Van de Velde* [second bishop of Chicago] (Mid-America, Oct.); Lydia Colby, ed., *A Pioneer in Lee County, Illinois: the Autobiography of Charles Francis Ingals* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Oct.); *Memoirs of William George Bruce* [III.] (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Sept.); *Two Minute Books of Kansas Missions in the Forties* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Aug.); Capt. Avery Sylvester, *Voyages of the Pallas and Chenamus, 1843–1845* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Sept.); J. Neilson Barry, *Astorians who became Permanent Settlers* (Washington Hist. Quar., Oct.).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

Jeremiah D. M. Ford and Maxwell I. Raphael have issued *A Bibliography of Cuban Belles-Lettres* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1933).

The Secretaría de relaciones exteriores of Mexico has published *Anuario bibliográfico mexicano de 1932; Bibliografía del estado de Morelos,* by Domingo Díez (No. 27 of the *Monografías bibliografías mexicanos*); and *Archivo general de la nación: Homenaje á don Valentín Gómez Farías,* containing material relating to the Mexican Constitution of 1857.

The dispute concerning Leticia is considered in J. M. Yepes, *Le conflit entre la Colombie et le Pérou devant le droit international* (Paris, Jouve).

André Labrouquère has published a treatise entitled *La Bolivie nouvelle, ses problèmes financières* (Paris, Domat-Montchrestien).

The struggle for the possession of the Chaco is considered by Pedro N.

Ciancio in *La guerra del Chacó; Bolivia y Paraguay ante la historia: América y el conflicto* (Buenos Aires, Talleres Gráficos, La Vanguardia).

La réparation des dommages causés aux étrangères par des mouvements révolutionnaires: Jurisprudence de la commission franco-mexicaine des réclamations, 1924–1932 (Paris, Pedone), contains four decisions of the Franco-Mexican Mixed Claims Commission established under the treaty of September 25, 1924, with an introduction by the Dutch jurist, J. H. W. Verzijl.

Articles: Narcisco Binayán, *Quesada historiador* (Nosotros, Aug.); Alberto J. Rodríguez, *Quesada sociólogo* (*ibid.*); Juan P. Ramos, *Quesada jurista* (*ibid.*); Enrique de Gandía, *El mito de las Amazonas en América* (*ibid.*); Arturo Marasso, *Rubén Darío* (*ibid.*, Sept.); Porfirio Fariña Núñez, *El maestro de Sarmiento* (*ibid.*); Ernesto Castillero R., *La causa inmediata de la emancipación de Panamá: Historia de los orígenes, la formación y el rechazo por el senado colombiano del tratado Herran-Hay* (Bol. Acad. Pan. Hist., July); Guillermo Furlong, *El libro de don Andrés Lamas sobre 'las agresiones de Rosas'* (Estudios, Aug.); E. Arana, *El doctor Felipe Arana, ministro de relaciones exteriores de la confederación* (*ibid.*); Jorge Manach, *Revolution in Cuba* (Foreign Affairs, Oct.); Gregorio Ormazon E., *La organización social del trabajo en el Ecuador* (An. Universidad Central, June); Eduardo Riofrio V., *Manuel de ciencias del trabajo aplicado al Ecuador* (*ibid.*); Carlos Salazar Flor, *Antecedentes históricos de las cuestiones limitrofes ecuatorianas y juicio del conflicto Colombo-Peruano* (*ibid.*); Max Uhle, *Estudio sobre las civilizaciones del Carchí e Imbabura* (*ibid.*); José de la Riva Agüero, *Homenaje centenario á don Ricardo Palma* (Bol. Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo, Sept.); Raimundo Rivas, *Colombia y España: La tentativa de reconciliación en 1851* (Bol. Hist. y Antig., Mar.); Juan D. Franco, *José Celestino Mutis* (*ibid.*, Apr.); Elizabeth Gratz Thomas, *Spanish Indian Policy in the West Indies and Mexico* (Mid-America, Oct.).

W. S. R.

Contributions have been made to the section of Historical News by J. M. S. Allison, S. F. Bemis, G. C. Boyce, J. P. Boyd, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, E. N. Curtis, G. M. Dutcher, Katharine J. Gallagher, M. B. Garrett, H. N. Howard, J. F. Jameson, M. L. W. Laistner, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, K. S. Latourette, G. G. MacCurdy, F. L. Nussbaum, W. S. Robertson, P. J. Treat, F. J. Tschan, A. B. West, R. K. Wyllys.